This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

6
7

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
LIBRARY

771-20967

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION

OF THE

Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland

1907

HELD AT THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

FRIDAY AND SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 29th and 30th, 1907

PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION

1908

121960

CONTENTS

Officers of the Association..... 3

Summary of Sessions..... 5

Response to the Address of Welcome.....*Woodrow Wilson.* 7

The Influence of the Present Methods of Graduate Instruction Upon the Teaching in the Secondary School.

Thomas M. Balliet..... 9

George E. Myers..... 17

General Discussion .....*Ernest G. Sihler*..... 23

John H. Harris..... 25

Julius Sachs..... 26

Admission to College by Certificate.....*Rush Rhees.* 28

Report of the Committee on the Establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board.....*Edwin S. Crawley.* 40

General Discussion .....*John K. Lord*..... 44

Julius Sachs 54

Thomas Fell 56

John K. Lord 57

Virgil Prettyman 59

James M. Green 59

William H. Crawshaw.... 63

William N. Marcy 65

Bertha Bass 67

William W. Birdsall..... 68

Charles D. Larkins 69

Wilson Farrand 70

Henry B. Mitchell 71

John T. Buchanan 72

President's Address: School and College..*Woodrow Wilson.* 73

Preparation for College as a Means of Education.

Thomas S. Baker..... 90

Jessie E. Allen 98

General Discussion .....*E. T. Jeffers.* 105

W. Addison Hervey..... 111

James G. Croswell..... 113

Miscellaneous Business 115
Treasurer's Report 115
Election of Officers 116
Appointment of Representatives of the Secondary Schools on the College Entrance Examination Board 116
Report of the Delegate of the Association to the National Conference Committee of the Associations of Colleges and Preparatory Schools 117
Report of the Committee on the Establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board 119
Officers of the Association, 1906-7 131
Publications of the Association for 1907..... 132
List of Members, 1907-8 133
Delegates Registered, 1907..... 137

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION 1907-1908

President

Mr. JAMES G. CROSWELL, Master of the Brearley School, New York City.

Vice-Presidents

President JOHN H. HARRIS, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.

Dean THOMAS M. BALLIET, New York University, New York City.

Principal WALTER B. GUNNISON, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Principal CHARLES S. CROSSMAN, Haverford School, Haverford, Pa.

Principal EDWARD C. WILSON, Friends' School, Baltimore, Md.

Secretary

Professor ARTHUR H. QUINN, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Treasurer

Professor JOHN B. KIEFFER, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

Executive Committee

President, Secretary and Treasurer, ex-officio.

President WOODROW WILSON, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Professor NELSON G. MCCREA, Columbia University, New York City.

Principal CHARLES D. LARKINS, Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Principal VIRGIL PRETTYMAN, Horace Mann High School, New York City.

TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION

HELD AT THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, NEW YORK CITY, N. Y., NOVEMBER 29–30, 1907

SUMMARY OF SESSIONS

First Session, Friday, November 29th, at 10.30 A. M., in Townsend Harris Hall.

Address of Welcome:

President JOHN H. FINLEY, of the College of the City of New York.

Response:

President WOODROW WILSON, Princeton University.

Topic: "The Influence of the Present Methods of Graduate Instruction upon the Teaching in the Secondary School."

Dean THOMAS M. BALLIET, New York University.

Principal GEORGE E. MYERS, McKinley Manual Training High School, Washington, D. C.

General Discussion:

Professor ERNEST G. SIHLER, New York University.

President JOHN H. HARRIS, Bucknell University.

Professor JULIUS SACHS, Columbia University.

Second Session, Friday, November 29th, at 2.30 P. M., in Townsend Harris Hall.

Topic: "Admission to College by Certificate."

President RUSH RHEES, University of Rochester.

Report of the Committee on the Establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board.

Professor EDWIN S. CRAWLEY, University of Pennsylvania.

General Discussion:

Opened by Professor JOHN K. LORD, Dartmouth College.

Professor JULIUS SACHS, Columbia University.

President THOMAS FELL, St. John's College.

Professor JOHN K. LORD, Dartmouth College.
Principal VIRGIL PRETTYMAN, Horace Mann High School, New York City.
Principal JAMES M. GREEN, New Jersey State Normal School, Trenton, N. J.
Dean WILLIAM H. CRAWSHAW, Colgate University.
Mr. WILLIAM N. MARCY, Mackenzie School, Dobb's Ferry, N. Y.
Miss BERTHA BASS, Wadleigh High School, New York City.
Principal WILLIAM W. BIRDSALL, High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.
Principal CHARLES D. LARKINS, Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Headmaster WILSON FARRAND, Newark Academy, Newark, N. J.
Professor HENRY B. MITCHELL, Columbia University.
Dr. JOHN T. BUCHANAN, DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City.

Third Session, Friday, November 29th, at 8 P. M., in Townsend Harris Hall.

President's Address: "School and College."
President WOODROW WILSON, Princeton University.

Reception tendered to the members of the Association by President and Mrs. Finley.

Fourth Session, Saturday, November 30, at 10 A. M., in Townsend Harris Hall.

Topic: "Preparation for College as a Means of Education."
Dr. THOMAS S. BAKER, Tome Institute, Port Deposit, Md.
Miss JESSIE E. ALLEN, High School for Girls, Philadelphia.

General Discussion:
Opened by President E. T. JEFFERS, York Collegiate Institute, York, Pa.
Professor WILLIAM A. HERVEY, Columbia University.
Mr. JAMES G. CROSWELL, Master of the Brearley School, New York City.

12 M. Business Meeting and Election of Officers.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Twenty-first Annual Convention

FIRST SESSION.

Friday, November 29th, at 10.30 A. M.

President Woodrow Wilson Presiding.

After a few words of welcome by President Finley, of the College of the City of New York, President Wilson said:

President Finley, I am very happy to acknowledge, with gratitude for the Association, the words of welcome that you have just uttered.

President Finley has been kind enough and prudent enough to say that I was going to deliver an admirable address this evening. I say prudent enough because it is always more prudent to praise an address before you have heard it than after; and therefore I shall not say more this morning than that it is a very pleasant circumstance, indeed, to find ourselves in this beautiful place.

It is true that this place stands in some senses at the gate of the continent, and yet it is not true that these buildings stand near the actual gate; and therefore it may often require some special errand to bring us this far uptown. We are very glad to have been drawn so far uptown to see this noble group of buildings, but more particularly to feel the warmth that inhabits them in the hearts and minds of the men who are conducting this institution.

You know that at Princeton we are now engaged in that new industry, the production of college presidents. We will devote a special chair to it. I mean that we expect the occupants of the chair to supply the now exigent demand for this kind of material.

Our chair of politics has been occupied so far by only two persons—by President Finley and by the gentleman who will presently become President Garfield of Williams College. I am now seeking a suitable third person, to be for a little while Professor of Politics and afterward president of some institution. I therefore feel the pleasure in listening to President Finley that one feels in listening to a home voice. It is very delightful to have known him so long and intimately as we did, and I cannot help feeling that there is in my breast some family sense of welcome here, of being welcomed to a place where at any rate a very beloved friend of ours has come to preside, and I am sure that all of you who know President Finley will share with me the feeling of personal regard and of personal gratification at the association with him. It is therefore in many ways grateful to be welcomed to this place, and I am sure that we shall feel the hospitality of it grow in warmth as the sessions continue in length.

I am now going to give myself the pleasure of proceeding with the programme of the morning, and I hope that if the speakers of the morning are both present they will be kind enough to come to the platform—Dr. Balliet and Mr. Myers.

The topic is "The Influence of the Present Methods of Graduate Instruction upon the Teaching in the Secondary School," and I shall ask Dean Thomas M. Balliet, of New York University, to introduce the discussion.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE PRESENT METHODS OF GRADUATE INSTRUCTION UPON THE TEACHING IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL.

DEAN THOMAS M. BALLIET, SCHOOL OF PEDAGOGY, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

The Secretary of this Association, when he assigned me this subject, instructed me to present a brief paper which might form the basis for a general discussion rather than a somewhat lengthy one dealing more in detail with the various phases of this interesting topic. I will endeavor to follow these instructions as best I can.

The influence of our colleges, through their requirements for admission, upon the curriculum and the teaching in our secondary schools has been very great in the past and is still quite marked. To the colleges must be credited very largely the establishment of laboratories in our secondary schools and the consequent reform in the teaching of the natural sciences. The colleges have also in recent years greatly stimulated the study of English and of the modern languages in these schools. That this "domination of the college," as it is termed, is not always wholesome—is, indeed, in some respects harmful to a marked degree—is a familiar fact; but I take it that this is not a part of the topic under discussion.

What is the influence of present methods of graduate instruction on the teaching in secondary schools?

The main function of the graduate schools in American universities, as indeed also in those of Europe, seems to be to train teachers for the universities, the colleges and the secondary schools. Are the methods of instruction in these graduate schools as effective in training teachers for the secondary schools as they confessedly are in training teachers for the universities? Or do the general aims of these three types of institutions, and the degree of maturity of their students, require each a somewhat different training for its teachers? In what respects does the present training in our graduate schools meet the special needs of teachers in our secondary schools and in what respects does it fail to do so? These seem to be the questions suggested by our subject.

Comparatively speaking, only a few teachers now teaching in secondary schools have done any graduate work at all. But there is no doubt that the effect of such graduate work upon those who have enjoyed it has been to elevate their ideals of scholarship, to give them a more thorough grasp of the subjects which they are teaching, and to develop in them more strictly scientific methods of study than mere collegiate training can give. But does it adequately fit them to present the subjects of the secondary school curriculum as they should be presented to the relatively immature minds of the boys and girls who attend these schools? If not, wherein lies its weakness and what is the remedy?

I will try to suggest tentative answers to these questions as a basis for fuller discussion, and I will do so briefly, and, for the sake of brevity, dogmatically.

The best graduate schools in this country, as in European countries, make it their chief aim to train the student in methods of scientific research, and require of him a thesis for the doctor's degree which shall not only prove his familiarity with scientific method but shall also make an original contribution to human knowledge. It is quite true that this ideal is frequently not realized, yet it determines the method of instruction, and it makes it necessary for the student to confine his special investigation to a very limited portion of a single science.

It is a commonplace to say that the thorough investigation of a single problem in any science necessarily touches upon many phases of that science and upon related sciences; yet such study of the broader field of science is only incidental to the particular problem to be investigated by the student, does not give a true perspective of the field as a whole, and does not arouse an interest in it as a whole. Such thorough training in a limited field, involving a high degree of specialization is just the training required to fit the student for the position of teacher in a university and of the upper classes in a college, but it fails to give that broad interest in and mastery of a group of related sciences which fits a teacher to do effective work in any one of them in a secondary school. In our large city high schools specialization among teachers has already gone too far. It has the effect of narrowing their interest and finally their scholarship, for in a secondary school the treatment of all subjects must be quite elementary, and the relations between the various subjects must be

constantly brought out. A teacher of physics should be prepared also to teach chemistry, geology, and astronomy; a teacher of Greek or Latin should be prepared to teach either language, and also Greek and Roman history. He will teach these languages the better if he also teaches classical history, which will enable him to give the historic setting of the literature which he is reading with his classes. It has been said that George Washington to many people is nothing but a steel engraving; we must see to it that in teaching Latin Cæsar is not merely a book called the Gallic War, and Cicero a certain number of orations.

The highly specialized training of the best graduate schools seems to make it difficult for the young teacher to view his work from the standpoint of his pupils rather than from that of his subject. It is absolutely necessary that the chief interest of the teacher in a secondary school be in his pupils rather than in his subject; and the perennial source of interest in secondary school work must be in the new problems which each new class, and, indeed, each new pupil, presents, more than in any researches which the teacher has the time and strength to make in his special field. A teacher in a secondary school whose deepest interest is in his subject will find, after a series of years, secondary school work exceedingly disappointing and uninteresting. Such work is altogether too elementary to be a source of inspiration from the standpoint of scholarship, and it is altogether too taxing on one's strength, because of its amount, to make it possible privately to pursue one's specialty in its higher departments. A teacher who is required to teach Latin or mathematics for five hours during the day is not likely to read Tacitus or study the calculus in the evening for pleasure. In short, in the secondary school, as in the elementary school, the teacher's interest must be in his pupil more than in his subject, and it would be well if this were more the case in our colleges than it is; while in the university, where the student is mature and is prepared for advanced specialized study, the interest of the teacher may well be chiefly in his subject.

To the immature mind interest in natural science, and to a large extent in mathematics, lies not in the pure science, but in the applications of the science to the phenomena of nature and to our industrial and social life. The establishment of laboratories in our secondary schools, while it was a great step in

advance, has not developed, after all, an interest in science to the extent it was hoped it would. Compared with the total attendance, the classes in physics in our public high schools are phenomenally small and have been decreasing for a series of years. Biology has never been a popular study. The classes in chemistry are also relatively small. Now, the natural sciences are intrinsically interesting to pupils of the secondary school age if well taught, and when they are not, the teaching is at fault. In our laboratories the pupil makes his experiment, observes the result, formulates a generalization and writes it in a notebook. That, in most cases, is the end of it. He does not know what his generalizations mean beyond the fact that they seem to explain the phenomena observed in the experiment, and these phenomena are neither intrinsically interesting nor exceptionally important to him. If, on the other hand, the teacher would take these laws and principles formulated in the laboratory out of doors and lead the pupil to use them as a key to unlock the mysteries of physical nature and of life, they would acquire a meaning for the pupil and an interest which they cannot possibly have as mere generalizations. There is more educational value, to an immature mind at least, in knowing one principle in physics and seeing fifty applications of it in the interpretation of the phenomena of nature or the facts of life than in knowing fifty principles as mere generalizations of the laboratory. There is no reason, for example, why in physics the whole of meteorology in its elements should not be taught, for it is little else than applied physics. In like manner chemistry should be taught in its application to everyday life, and biology should be treated in a way to show its practical application to agriculture, the industries and to the problems of personal and public hygiene.

In short, the sciences should be taught as applied sciences to beginners in secondary schools for the purpose of arousing a deep interest in them; in college and the university they may be taught in their more abstract form as pure sciences, and in the higher technical school they must necessarily again be taught as applied sciences for practical reasons.

In like manner mathematics can be made to appeal to pupils of secondary schools much more strongly if the application to the conditions of life are emphasized at every point before they are studied in their abstract or pure form. The present move-

ment among teachers of physics and also among teachers of mathematics to make these studies more real and more vital in secondary schools by relating them to life is one of the most hopeful movements in secondary education that has developed in recent years.

Now, the contention is that the graduate instruction in our universities does virtually nothing to fit a teacher to teach either science or mathematics in this vital way in secondary schools. It may even be possible that the highly specialized training of the graduate school, to a certain extent, unfits the student to do this sort of teaching. However that may be, I state a well-known fact when I say that not one in fifty of the men and women who take the doctor's degree in science or in mathematics has the least conception of the problem before him when he begins teaching in a secondary school.

In literature the training in our graduate schools is too analytical, too philological and critical to give a student the best preparation as a teacher in a secondary school. In this respect the training in our graduate schools, together with the requirements of admission to our colleges, largely vitiates the teaching of English in our secondary schools. It is true that the colleges and universities have aroused a deeper interest in English in secondary schools, but they have done virtually nothing to point out a better method. We might say, in a general way, that the methods of the university and of the college have got into our secondary schools and vitiated the teaching of English. These methods are not always good even for college and university students, and they are very generally bad for secondary school boys and girls.

Literature is essentially art, and it must be taught as art. It must be made to appeal powerfully to the imagination and to the emotions; it must hold up before the pupil's mind right ideals of life, must interpret life to him, and must minister to his spiritual development. Indeed, in its higher functions it is closely allied to religion as a factor in the pupil's spiritual growth.

Now, literature cannot be made to appeal to the pupil in this way when treated analytically, philologically, or critically. To treat a work of art in this way in presenting it to immature minds is to destroy it as a work of art. We do not get the meaning of the Venus de Milo or the Apollo Belvedere by mak-

ing a chemical analysis of the marble, nor the meaning of sorrow by knowing the chemical ingredients of tears and the physiological mechanism of the sigh.

To present literature in this vitalizing way it is above all necessary that the teacher be a person of artistic rather than scientific temperament. As the scientific temperament is usually unfitted to produce literature, so it is generally unfitted to teach it, and when a person attempts to teach literature in a secondary school, as sometimes happens, who is neither scientific nor artistic in his temperament, it is much easier to foretell what he will not do than what he will do. He who has no poetry in his own soul cannot make poetry vital in the life of others.

In the next place, the interpretation must be artistic, not scientific; it must be concrete, must present living wholes, not dissected parts. The most effective interpretation of literature is the artistic oral reading of it, and every teacher of literature in a secondary school should be a good reader. Literature should be so taught as to create a deep love for it. Analytical and critical methods do not accomplish this in secondary schools. Even in our adult years when we wish to read for pleasure we instinctively avoid the school editions of the English classics, with their pedantic, impertinent footnotes.

While I am not competent to criticize in detail the teaching of literature in our graduate schools, I know that the teachers trained in these schools do not, as a rule, teach literature as art when they begin work in secondary schools; they emphasize altogether too much the critical, analytical and historical phases of the study to make it mean what it should to boys and girls in their teens.

This treatment of literature involves necessarily also the careful selection of what is to be read with special reference to the needs of immature pupils. This is a matter which it may not be the province of the graduate school to deal with, as it is primarily a pedagogical problem, and yet the graduate school might at least impress upon the student who is to go into secondary school work the importance of the problem, and the college might help to solve it by prescribing the right kind of literature in its admission requirements. It is difficult to determine on what principles much of the English now prescribed for secondary schools is selected, except that it must be out of copyright and must lend itself readily to examination purposes.

What are the remedies?

I venture to sugggest, in a purely tentative way, the following as possible but perhaps only partial remedies.

The graduate school might make a distinction between two classes of students, those who are fitting themselves to teach in universities and colleges and those who are preparing to teach in secondary schools. The former might be required to limit their study to a narrow specialty, to carry on an exhaustive research, and produce a thesis which not only shows a mastery of scientific method but also gives evidence of productive work and makes a contribution to the science to which it relates. The latter might be allowed to work in a broader field, to acquire a fair mastery of several related sciences, without being required to specialize narrowly, and be permitted to present a thesis which gives evidence of their having made themselves familiar with the methods of research in the subjects which they expect to teach without requiring them to make any strictly original contribution to their specialty.

No university lives up to its ideals to the extent of requiring in all cases an original contribution to science for the doctorate. The number of brilliant discoveries made by young doctors of philosophy is remarkably small. What I am advocating is therefore not a lowering of the present standards of graduate work, but rather a frank recognition of these standards as they actually exist, and an intelligent discrimination between these two classes of students.

If it should be objected that this would make the promotion of teachers from secondary schools to universities very difficult, it might be said in reply that such promotions are so rare in this country, and in Europe as well, that this is a wholly secondary consideration.

The treatment of literature as art in our graduate schools, at least in the case of students who wish to fit themselves for positions in secondary schools, might profitably be emphasized more than it is, much as our best graduate schools are now doing in this direction.

It would probably not vitiate, much less contaminate, as some persons imagine, the teaching of pure science and pure mathematics in our graduate schools, if some considerable emphasis

were laid incidentally upon their application, at least in the training of teachers for secondary schools.

As a student and teacher of pedagogy, I am probably far from impartial when I suggest that the most important remedy would be to oblige every student in a graduate school who wishes to teach in a secondary school—or in a college—to study education both as a science and as an art, and make himself familiar with the best methods of teaching the subject which he is fitting himself to teach. In Prussia such training is a universal requirement of all candidates for positions in secondary schools, and the day is not far distant when the same requirement will be made in the progressive States of this country. The rapid development of departments of education and schools of education in our colleges and universities indicates that there already exists a wide recognition of the need of such training. Many teachers in colleges and universities have not in the past looked with much favor upon the department of education, and some of them still view it with a certain misgiving such as one naturally feels in the presence of the unknown; but more light is also bringing more sweetness, and their attitude is becoming steadily more friendly as these departments are growing in efficiency and in strength.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE PRESENT METHODS OF GRADUATE INSTRUCTION UPON THE TEACHING IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

DR. GEORGE E. MYERS, PRINCIPAL OF THE M'KINLEY MANUAL TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL, OF WASHINGTON, D. C.

A few years ago, while a student at the University of Chicago, I heard the late President Harper predict that the day was not far distant when the degree of doctor of philosophy would be as necessary a qualification of the high school teacher as was the bachelor's degree then. While the day has not yet arrived, there is much evidence of progress in this direction. Everywhere the secondary teacher is required to measure up to higher standards of scholarship. The teacher with graduate training is appointed over the one without it, and the one with two or three years of such training over the one with less. And, all things else being equal, promotion comes more quickly to the teacher with extensive graduate training.

The high school is in this way coming more and more under the direct influence of the university and of the methods of university instruction. The university is also influencing secondary education strongly through the colleges. Most high school teachers have studied in the colleges under professors, and especially under instructors, who follow closely the methods of teaching with which they became familiar in the days of their graduate study. College entrance requirements, the discussions of such gatherings as this, and the preparation of secondary textbooks by college and university professors also serve to extend the influence of the universities over secondary instruction.

It must be recognized that methods of graduate instruction differ more or less in different universities. One university which I might name stands pre-eminently for research from the time a student matriculates until he secures his doctor's degree. Another institution places greater emphasis upon its regular class work, particularly during the earlier part of the course. Again, these methods differ considerably in different departments of the same university. The nature of the subject has much to do with determining the method of teaching it. Graduate history must, in

many respects, be taught differently from graduate physics or psychology, and graduate mathematics differently from graduate English. It would be interesting and profitable to discuss the question before us for each subject of the high school curriculum separately, but lack of time forbids. There are, however, certain well-known general characteristics of present methods of graduate instruction which are common to all universities and to all their departments. These only can be considered in this brief paper.

In considering these characteristics of graduate teaching, with a view to determine their influence on secondary instruction, it is well to bear in mind that I am not discussing the wisdom of these methods in the graduate school. It is for university presidents and heads of departments to determine the proper aims of university instruction and the best methods of attaining these aims. Nor am I discussing the value of graduate training for the high school teacher. Every sane educator recognizes its value, and would have more of it rather than less. It is, however, not only the privilege, but the duty of the secondary school principal to inquire in what respects university methods make for efficiency and in what respects they make for inefficiency in secondary teaching.

The lecture method has come down from the university and the college into the secondary school. Every principal of a large high school is familiar with it in at least some of his departments. English and history lend themselves to this method more readily than other high school subjects, but none are entirely free from its influence. We find a physics lecture-room, a biology lecture-room, and a chemistry lecture-room in all of our best high schools, and the lecture method has given them this name.

There can be no question that this method has done much to make the secondary teacher superior to and independent of his text-book, teaching the subject rather than a book. If wisely used, it widens the pupil's outlook on the topic of the lesson and helps him to see its relations to other topics. On the other hand, this method is frequently used in such a way as to scatter the pupil's interest over too broad a field, to lead his attention away from the essential facts of the lesson. Too often it serves to show the teacher's superior knowledge rather than to enlighten the pupil. If the lecture is to be of the greatest permanent value to him, he must take notes and study these notes later. But the

average high school pupil is slow at note-taking, and misses much that is important. He does not take notes at all unless he is pretty sure that questions will be asked about the lecture later, perhaps in examination. Some time ago, while visiting a third-year high school English class, I heard a university trained teacher give what was to me a very interesting account of the development of the drama. Pupils were given much information not found in their text-books, and undoubtedly secured a wider outlook on the topic of the lesson. But none of them took notes, and I have reason to believe that the teacher did not follow up the lecture later with questins on it. Furthermore, much of the lecture was beyond them. It was suited to college or university classes, rather than to high school classes. The real difficulties of this method in the secondary school are, first, that the teacher loses sight of the proper aim of the high school, and, second, that he does not take sufficient account of his pupil's stage of development. More will be said about these difficulties later.

To be sure, research, in the sense of carrying on original investigations with a view to adding to the sum of human knowledge, has not found its way into secondary schools. But the simplest laboratory experiment has in it the essential elements of research. It is an effort to find out first hand what will happen under given conditions. That the same thing has been found out a thousand times before in the same way, and that it is now found out under the direction of a teacher, does not alter the fact that the research method is employed. And it is obvious that the research spirit in the universities has had, and is having to-day, a tremendous influence in developing the laboratory work in our secondary schools.

Another aspect of the research method—the investigation of original sources—has also influenced secondary instruction strongly, particularly in English and history. The high school pupil of to-day does not, to be sure, make an exhaustive study of sources, as a graduate student does, but he is frequently referred to the library to look up fuller information than his text-book affords on the topic in hand, or is assigned some special topic upon which to report. He is required to become more or less familiar with many of the sources of information from which the author of his text-book drew. That this is due, directly or indirectly, to the influence of university work cannot be ques-

tioned. In Nebraska, the State University requires that all high school history work be done by the source-method if it is to be accepted for entrance to the college work of that institution.

But the influences of the research method upon secondary instruction are not wholly good. High school students everywhere are suffering from misguided efforts at its introduction. Teachers fresh from college or university, and experienced teachers who are too much under the spell of college entrance requirements, are often disposed to bring over the method almost bodily from the higher institutions. Many secondary teachers of biology attempt to require of their pupils careful and accurate microscopic work upon a small number of species when it is far more important that these boys and girls should become interested in a large number of the myriad forms of life by which they are surrounded. High school teachers of physics contend that their subject cannot be successfully taught below the third or fourth year of the course. It cannot, as most of them teach it. Let them adapt their methods of teaching, and the amount of the subject taught, to the early adolescent stage of development; let them be more concerned about putting the pupil in touch with his environment than about preparing him for college, and physics can be made a fascinating and profitable study for first-year students. These students will not measure up to the college entrance requirements in the subject, but that is another matter. Those who drop out of school during the first and second years will then have something which means more to them than if they had devoted all their time to language and mathematics.

A third characteristic of graduate instruction of importance to us is the greater emphasis on the theoretical and the abstract than on the practical and concrete. The university professor seeks to interest his students in causes and principles more than in phenomena. He appeals to the scientific and critical attitude of mind. He reduces the illlustrative to a minimum. He often considers a single statement of a proposition sufficient. All this is suited to the mature graduate student, and may not be entirely out of place with the college student in the later years of his course. But many a secondary teacher, particularly in the early years of his experience, works with disastrous effects along the same lines. Recalling that his study of literature in the

university was critical, he encourages the development of a spirit of literary criticism in pupils, when they need to have developed above all else an appreciation of the masterpieces of literature. Or, remembering that algebraic principles received great emphasis in his higher mathematics, he attempts to make his pupils master principles underlying algebraic operations when they do well if they master operations and formulæ. Whatever the subject taught, this teacher fails to illustrate sufficiently, lacks concreteness and teaches over the heads of his pupils. The high school pupil is not naturally critical. He is interested in action and phenomena rather than in motives and forces. Facts and operations appeal to him more strongly than theories and principles; the concrete than the abstract. The trouble is the same that has been pointed out before, viz., adopting university methods without adapting them, or without even trying to determine whether they can be adapted.

It may also be noted that nearly all high school text-books prepared by college and university men place too great emphasis on the theoretical and the abstract. Professor Slaught, of the University of Chicago, in a recent article in the *School Review,* speaks of "the increasing tendency of the text-books to force the recondite reasoning and theoretical side of the subject (mathematics) farther and farther down in the course, so that the beginners become appalled, discouraged, and not infrequently overwhelmed." These writers of text-books who teach in colleges or universities are accustomed to deal with more mature minds than those of secondary pupils. They are also apt to place undue importance upon those aspects of the subject which, in their judgment, fit the pupil for college work.

No doubt there are other characteristics of university instruction which exercise a considerable influence on secondary teaching. But these suffice to bring out clearly the general character of this influence. With the humanities, it is in the direction of broadening the teaching, making it less a matter of text-book and more a matter of subject. It makes the teaching of sciences less didactic and more investigative. On the other hand, the influence is in the direction of the abstract and the theoretical rather than the concrete and the practical. It favors the development of the critical attitude at the expense of the appreciative. It tends to make science teaching intensive in character. It

places, or tends to place, greater emphasis on the *subject* than on the pupil.

The question now arises, "How can the secondary school profit by the helpful and avoid the harmful influences of present methods of graduate instruction?" I have already indicated that the trouble is not so much with the university methods, *per se,* as with the secondary teacher and text-book. The secondary teacher fails to keep sharply in mind two things—(1) the difference between the aim of secondary instruction and the aim of university instruction, (2) the adjustment of matter and of method to the pupil's stage of development.

The aim of university instruction is to make specialists; the aim of high school instruction is chiefly cultural and practical. The aim of university instruction is intensive; of high school instruction, extensive. The university student has found himself, has learned to depend on himself, has fixed habits of study and of work, has gained control of his emotions and impulses is pursuing his course with a definite purpose. The high school boy is in the throes of a physical and emotional change fraught with great possibilities; he lacks the power of concentration, he is just forming habits of study, has begun to feel the liberties of self-dependence without its responsibilities, has as a rule but a hazy notion of the purpose of his work. The celebrated neurologist, Clouston, has said, "The brain at eight and the same brain at twenty-five might belong to two different species of animals, so far as its essential qualities go." The high school student is in the midst of this change, the university student is just completing it.

There is, therefore, but one answer to the question asked a moment ago. If you would have your secondary schools profit most from the methods of graduate study, give your secondary teacher *professional training* as well as extensive training in the special subject he is to teach. Be sure that he has definite and correct ideas as to the aims of secondary education, that he is familiar with the psychology of interest and suggestion, that he knows the psychology of adolescence, that he has had a "definite course in recasting his subject from the pupil's point of view," and you need have no fear of the influence of present methods of graduate instruction upon the work of the secondary school.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

PROFESSOR ERNEST G. SIHLER, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.—It so happens (I think I am excused if I point to a matter of personal biography) that my life has been somewhat more proportionately allotted first, to secondary work, then to college and graduate work, the latter considerably overbalancing the former. All this, however (if I may be again excused), followed upon six years of exclusive graduate work; therefore giving not only a very remarkably healthy life to education and research, but favored in many ways by a wide knowledge of both sides of the Atlantic, what they are doing and what we are doing as well —I beg to speak to you of the two things that are in my opinion defective—defective in our secondary schools.

I believe that it was the influence of President Eliot that put everything in the high school on a level of equivalence. Now, ladies and gentlemen, this I consider a most deplorable and vicious condition—that the high school has been somehow hothoused into a small university. That is in itself a thing that no nation on the globe has ever undertaken to do; but we do. Now we (I am a native, also, I have to assert)—we are experimental, we are mechanical; we are the greatest mechanical nation on the globe. Out of the success, of the remarkable success that we have had, not only in making polities, constitutions, settling them on the whole successfully, but also in conquering a continent, in finding mechanical devices to put almost every force of nature into the service of our material civilization (because after all that is the main thing, not into our intellectual civilization at all; because that remains with the spirit, and no machines will do anything to advance that); I say out of this we have got the ruinous idea that *all* subjects must be taught in a high school. That, in the first place, I consider a thing that we have somehow or other (if not we, then the next generation) to abandon. The child at that stage is not fit to study *any* given thing out of all possible things—study in the higher sense.

I read with critical care not long ago the volume of educational essays which President Eliot has published. There we have some great qualities, a broad view, but also the chemist's characteristic conception: any subject is matter (with the chemist, of course,

all is matter), that any subject is matter, and any matter may be subject, and that if we only apply a certain amount of method and concern we will get the same pounds, the same ounces, the same amount of educational benefit and results. No other nation in the world undertakes to do what we do, whether preparing for college or giving a general education terminating with that stage of work. This scattering, as I would call it—this scattering (based on a mechanical conception of things) which we perpetrate—we don't hurt other nations by it, because we are more insular, but we do injure ourselves. Let me call your attention to a great fact: we are a great deal more insular than the English are. You see, the English are separated by the Channel, and it is a great cleavage for politics and climate, but it is not a cleavage, sir, for culture; but we are separated by oceans east and west. The Canadians in the Rhodes scholarship competition, as well as the Australians, have made us to blush by the shallowness and the poor classical knowledge of the young men that we have picked out and sent to Oxford. And then we were told to console ourselves, that our young gentlemen could jump high with their legs; that they could run within the ten seconds, and do other things as relevant as these. That was our consolation; and our journalistic brothers no doubt thought it was a force—a greater force, and on the whole it was *our* way of excelling; therefore, what was the use of fussing about the classics? I say this insularity has tempted us to these varied methods of what I call tentative or experimental things in dealing with the tender powers of the young.

We must bring our high schools down to a smaller number of great subjects. Of course, the idea of bringing the university or college into the high school, that method strikes me as a paradox of crudity, as absurd, deleterious, and pernicious. On the other hand, I will say this (and I say it on the basis of successful teaching in the secondary schools many years ago): you cannot know too much to teach a child. It is absurd to say that if your knowledge is limited, if your culture, your professional culture, is the more limited, the better will you teach. It is a deplorable and a mechanical conception of the truth. You cannot know, you cannot divine at what moment the divine scintilla of concern and profound interest may be evoked from your class or body of children or young people. That is the moment to forge; that is the moment to build. You will not fail. It is your

duty to kindle that spark, to bring interest to that moment of life and growth. If you have a wide knowledge, why, you can, of course, bring in many things from the wide knowledge that is at your service that will produce that glorious, genetic bound in the intellectual life of the class and the pupils constituting it; but if you merely are a machine (I know there are a great many; I am sorry to say there are a great many such machines in secondary teaching), a machine that presses certain buttons, that has pressed them often, that turns certains wheels, asks certain questions, gets certain answers, and perhaps these answers are given with a good deal of glibness; but there is nothing appreciative in the souls and minds of those children. You could make a brave showing before your principal, a very brave showing before your State or school superintendent, and you have really taught not at all; you have merely touched certain buttons and got certain reverberations.

That sort of teaching, I am sorry to say, is still greatly abounding in our land. I hope that the time will come when we will abandon the idea that our high schools are little universities; when we will actually cut down the subjects and limit them and make them thorough, and not treat the child as a little man. It flatters (of course, it flatters) us; it flatters a certain element of egotism in us that we can point to all these brave outward paraphernalia of mechanism; but it is not teaching; it is a form of civic parade; but it does result in one thing, in considering as a basis, as a foundation, something which simply turns out later, in the maturity of life, to have been a painted piece of cardboard.

President John H. Harris, Bucknell University.—One point we cannot emphasize too much, a point that was brought out by all three of the speakers, that is, the necessity of training the graduate, either of the college or of the university, to teach. A good deal of the work of the colleges and universities is neither teaching nor investigating; it is simply talk. Learned talk often; eloquent sometimes; but still talk.

Teaching in a great many places is getting to be a lost art. It is so much easier to talk than to teach, and so much more pleasant (at least for one party), that when a man once gets into that habit it is very unlikely that he will ever recover; and when it becomes the dominant method of an institution it is not likely that the institution will change.

Now, in all the essentials of education, in thoroughness, in exactness and in the power of earnest and prolonged attention, we have to depend more and more upon the teacher in the secondary school, and if the youth are to receive such education they must get it, for the most part, from the secondary schools, or else they will not get it at all. So we cannot emphasize too much the necessity of preparing in the colleges and universities for the kind of teaching that should be done at the stage of development of the secondary school, and not import methods some of which are suitable enough for graduate work, but are wholly unsuited to students either in the secondary schools or in the first years of college.

PROF. JULIUS SACHS, TEACHERS' COLLEGE, NEW YORK.—The same topic which is now under discussion will engage the attention of this gathering during the greater part of its session. The homogeneousness of the programme is remarkable; the discussion to-morrow will certainly be very closely affiliated with this subject.

I feel, however, that several points touched upon this morning in the two papers ought not to go without further emphasis; particularly in Dean Balliet's paper there were a number of points that ought to convey a sense of responsibility to those who have the training of the future secondary teachers in charge, and certain of the prominent institutions in this country are recognizing very distinctly this one limitation which has been brought to our notice: that the very intensity of research, the high degree of specialization, brings about almost inevitably a narrowness which it should be the province of the university to counteract. In one institution at least that need is distinctly recognized, and an attempt has been made to widen the horizon of the graduate students by a series of non-technical lectures aiming at this very point: to open the minds of the students to the fact that their particular subject is only one branch of information, and that its real value consists in their appreciation of the attainments and the progress in other lines of work. That same difficulty, resulting from excessive specialization, which our graduate students feel when they go out into teaching—or ought to feel—has been recognized elsewhere. It is not peculiar to ourselves, and if there is any crumb of comfort in that, we may take just so much comfort from it. To a degree the same thing holds in

France and Germany, and it has been proclaimed distinctly in Germany that there ought to be a type of scientific training in the universities making directly for the future educational work of the secondary teacher.

They have been trying to create there a development which it is a little difficult to render by an English term. They are speaking now of "Schul-wissenschaften"—the treatment of the various subjects with a view to their application in the schools. A man may carry on mathematical instruction of a high order in the university, but may never feel how the work that he has been undertaking bears upon its service to the school. It should be the province of at least one man in every faculty to cultivate that sense of utilization that cannot be expected of all men (those who are given to research may not be drawn to that line of work); but in view of the fact that so many of our teachers—so many of our graduate students—do enter the field of secondary education, especially in women's colleges, it seems to me that that ought to be a need more and more felt: the creation in every faculty of a certain line of work which shall link the work—the highly specialized work—to the future service of the secondary school. Probably many of those defects that Dean Balliet called attention to so effectively would disappear; for instance, this wholesale transfer of the laboratory method to the secondary school. Those very ones of us who welcomed the name and the idea of the laboratory method when it first was ushered into existence have had reason to deplore its efflorescence. "Laboratory method" is applied everywhere, not only to the sciences, but the name is applied to history and is applied to English, and the dissecting process, which may be more or less proper on the biological table, is also applied to English literature, with very sad results, as has been outlined.

The counterbalance must be furnished by the university men. They have led in introducing this new idea; let them also lead in applying the corrective.

SECOND SESSION

Friday, November 29th, at 2.30 P. M.

ADMISSION TO COLLEGE BY CERTIFICATE.

PRESIDENT RUSH RHEES, UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER.

I interpret the task that has been assigned to me this afternoon literally and rigidly in the terms that have been used by the presiding officer, namely, that of introducing a topic on which I am confident there will be so much divergence of opinion that the discussion will be exceedingly active and alive.

It is unfortunate for me—in one sense unfortunate for you—that in giving consideration to this topic I have not had the opportunity to inquire into the history of the certificate system of admission to college. It would be an exceedingly interesting matter to know how colleges first came to accept the word of the principals of schools concerning the competency of students to do college work, in lieu of their own established customary method of examination of such candidates for admission to college. Not knowing anything about that subject, I have the temerity to express the suspicion that the certificate system, now widely spread, owes its origin in some measure to an altogether unhealthy condition in our academic life, namely, a competition between colleges for students. Anything which will reduce the difficulty of admission to college, in the mind of students seeking such admission, operates in a certain measure as a premium in the attractions which a given college is able to offer, and I fancy that those of us who represent colleges which practice the reception of students by certificate must frankly acknowledge to ourselves this possible element of weakness. I think that the acknowledgment of this fact will not in anywise veto an ultimate acceptance of the certificate principle, if we shall find that it can justify itself to our judgment on other grounds. This acknowledgment may, however, make us more conscientiously careful that the judgment which we form shall be based upon sound educational principles.

The admission of students to college in this country is determined, I think we may say now, by four different methods:

First, the old-established and well-recognized method of examination of the candidates by the institution at its own doors, or by its representatives in different parts of the country—the method which is practiced, so far as I am aware now, without exception by Harvard, Yale and possibly some other institutions. Secondly, because of the perplexity which arose in the minds of teachers preparing students for colleges, owing to different standards and definitions of entrance requirement, there developed, through the instrumentality of this Association, a Central Board of Examination, which conducts examinations set by its own representatives, examinations read by its own officials and rated by them; the results of the examinations so taken to be reported to the colleges interested, without recommendation as to what they should do with the reports so submitted. This is the work, as you all know, of the College Entrance Examination Board. To all intents and purposes it is identical with the system of examination by the individual college at its own doors, having only this advantage, that, in the first place, it enables students to take their examinations more at their convenience in different places throughout the country, and, in the second place, both unconsciously and avowedly it operates to reduce superficial differences and to bring a greater uniformity not only into the definition of requirements, but into the standard of examinations. It is, therefore, from the point of view of the examination system, a marked and definite advance.

A third method prevails very largely in the State of New York which interests also the colleges outside of the State of New York which receive students from that State, and that is the system of State examinations, conducted for the schools of the State, not primarily with a view to the admission of students into college, but with a view to determining the competency of students to receive graduation from secondary schools. This system of the Regents' examinations is similar to the system of examinations by the colleges in this respect, that it is a system of examination conducted by a body independent of the teaching force, and conducted by a body, therefore, unacquainted with the student to be examined.

The fourth system is that which we are particularly discussing this afternoon, which may be defined as an examination of schools rather than of students, whereby colleges or their representatives

have satisfied themselves that the work in preparation for college in any given school is of such a character that the college is justified in accepting the judgment of a school with reference to the fitness of an applicant to take college work. This judgment is expressed in the certification of such a student by the principal of the school. How that principal may reach his conclusion that a given student is competent to do college work is in a measure none of the college's business. He may reach the conclusion by conducting his own examinations; he may do so on the basis of his experience with that student through a period of four years, testing him by repeated examinations, or by the daily work, or in both ways, or in any way he pleases.

The principle which justifies in any measure the adoption of the certificate system for admission to college is simply this: that there is large advantage to be got from the judgment of a man acquainted with an applicant concerning that applicant's competency to do the kind of work which he will be asked to do in college. Now, those colleges which are willing to accept students on certificate justify, and may justify, that willingness on the ground that the experience of the colleges which admit only on examination is not such as to indicate the infallibility of the examination method. It happens often enough to be worthy of comment that an applicant by good luck or by cramming may find himself competent to meet the requirements set in the college's examinations, who then afterwards will prove to the college that in spite of his success in passing those examinations he is not fit to do college work. It may happen—has happened often enough to be a subject of consideration—that another student who, because of nervousness, of the strangeness of the situation and accidental peculiarities in the questions, does not succeed in meeting the college examinations, is nevertheless competent to do the college work. I have vividly in my memory the case of a man who entered college at the same time I did, and by examination as I did, of whom I was told shortly afterwards that his conditions upon that examination were so serious and so many that it was only with the utmost hesitancy and after long deliberation that the Faculty determined that he could be given a chance in the college; yet he took the prize on commencement day, was easily one of the leaders in the class, later took his doctor's degree, and is now teaching in a college in one of the Western

States with much distinction. The examination system rigidly enforced, without regard to the individual peculiarities of his case, would have thrown that man out, and I believe his case is not exceptional, but, as I have already stated, sufficiently illustrative of a frequent occurrence to be a matter for reasonable consideration.

We have, therefore, before our minds essentially two systems of admission to college: one by examination of the applicant by a body unknown to him, and not knowing him, and not acquainted with the character and the extent of the work that he has pursued in his school; the other, the admission to college on the basis of the statement of a man who stands in a position to know, to the effect that a given applicant for admission has done the work that is asked for by the college, and that he has done it with sufficient excellence and a sufficient degree of success in attainment to justify his going on into college work. Now, this certificate system prevails almost universally in what may be called the smaller colleges of the country. It is accepted in some of the larger colleges of the country. Yet I believe I am testifying the truth when I say that at the present time, at any rate outside of New England, there is probably no Faculty that does not express often to itself its conviction that the certificate system *as at present developed and administered* is unsatisfactory; that it has revealed certain definite weaknesses; hence it is of the very first moment that we determine whether or not those weaknesses are essential.

There is, on the one hand, the weakness which centres in the college administration, due to what I have ventured to suggest may have led at first to the acceptance of the certificate method of admission, namely, the eagerness of colleges to be in a position of advantage in bidding for students. There is no reason why we should seek to conceal the fact that there is a competition between colleges in this country that is not wholesome, and anything that can be done by such an association as this to eliminate that competition will be very greatly to the advantage of the educational system of the district of the country which we represent. Such competition leads unconsciously (for our college administrations are not wilfully dishonest) to a somewhat relaxed standard of criticism of the schools which certify and the students so certified. I think there are a great many of our colleges

that are not as conscientious as they might be in inquiring whether the students received by them for admission by certificate are standing up to the strain of college work, doing the kind of thing that they ought to be able to do, and so making it possible for the work of the class to have the efficiency and excellence that it ought to have in a class composed of students who have made the proper preparation for college work. There are some of us who are possibly a little indolent in scrutinizing these schools and telling them that their work is not up to the standard. This is one of the elements of weakness in the certification system.

Another element of weakness is closely allied to it, and would be impossible without such indolence on the part of the colleges, and that is an ambition on the part of the schools to get whatever prestige may attach to the fact that a given school's cerificates are accepted at this, that and the other college. I confess to some amusement and some little pain at an experience which comes frequently to administrations in the colleges which accept certificates, when schools that never have sent a student to the college, and in all human probability never will send a student to the college, submit their courses of study and curricula and ask to be registered as accepted schools. That ambition leads, I think, sometimes to another: a desire to send its students to college, to be known as sending its students to colleges, and therefore an acceptance of the somewhat relaxed stringency of college administrations as a justification for saying, "Well, he is a good boy; he has done reasonably good work and might just as well go on to college as not," and the certificate is issued, and in the hurry of life and the confusion that attends many affairs the school never is brought to book for that action.

Then a third element of weakness allied to this, but different, is that in the present organization sometimes a principal is subjected to so much pressure with reference to the certification of a given student that he gives the student, instead of the college and his school, the benefit of the doubt. It sometimes happens that a member of a city board of education, or a man prominent as a taxpayer, or a man of influence in the political organization speaks to the principal and says: "My boy wants to go to such and such a college. Now, he is a good boy, and you know he can work if he wants to; I want you to certify him." In such a case the principal has sometimes stretched his own conscience in certi-

fying to this, that or the other college that such a man is competent to do college work. Now, all these failures result from one shortcoming on the part of the colleges, namely, that they have forgotten that the certificate system is not the abandonment of examinations by the colleges, but that it is the subsitution of one examination for another; that the school itself should be examined by the college before the school may have the privilege of certifying its students to the college.

Now, this difficulty does not exist in some portions of our country where the certificate method of admission is practically universal. I mean, particularly, some of the Western States, in which the State university is the natural head of the educational system. In Michigan, for instance, there is a great rivalry on the part of the high schools of the State for registration as accepted schools in the University, and the University holds such a relation to the educational system of the State that it can hold over the schools the danger of the loss of their privilege of certification in case their students do not come up to the required standard. The University holds such a relation to the educational system of the State that it can send its representatives out into the schools to observe their instruction, advise concerning their course of study, point out the place where the course is inadequate or the instruction is faulty, and say: "You must correct those difficulties or we will not accept your students." Here is one cure for the present evil. It is the cure which can be exercised in such a situation as exists in these Western States. The practical problem for us is, is it a cure which can be exercised in an organization such as exists in the Middle States and Maryland?

There may come to your minds immediately the thought that in the State of New York at least it would seem to be possible to accomplish that desired result. For we have in New York a central body having the authority of inspection; the power to say to a school, "Your work does not come up to grade"; to say to it, "You must do this," "You must do that," and an organization which discharges that responsibility. The essential difference, however, which is of particular interest to us here is this, that the Education Department in the State of New York is organized specifically and avowedly for the purpose of aiding and guiding the primary and secondary education of the State, and

that the aim of this primary and secondary education is only, incidentally, preparation for college; that obviously the controlling concern of the Education Department is and must be to further the education which, in its judgment, shall be adequate as a preparation for life.

Now, to-morrow we are to have a discussion that promises to be highly interesting on the question of the relation of preparation for college to adequate preparation for life. It is obvious that that discussion has a vital relation to the topic we are considering this afternoon; but for the afternoon we may justly acknowledge that there is at least ground for the opinion that an education may be adequate for the graduation of a student from a high school that might not be acceptable for the passage of that student on for higher training. It is conceivable that the Education Department might say that a boy had done sufficiently well in mathematics or in Latin to receive a high school diploma, when the principal of the school in which that boy is trained would not certify that he is competent to go on with the higher mathematics or advanced Latin, or, equally, when the boy would not be competent to meet the test of the examinations set by the Examination Board or by individual colleges.

Now, all of the colleges in the State of New York and many colleges outside the State accept the credentials of the State Education Department. They differ from the credentials of the College Entrance Examination Board in two essential particulars, although they agree in the fact that they are based upon examinations set by an authority outside of the school and the rating is made by those having no personal acquaintance with the student.

The first difference lies in the fact that the examinations are not set with the purpose of demonstrating a student's fitness to enter college, but his fitness to leave the high school with its diploma. It may be that these two standards of fitness ought to be one. They are not as yet identical, however. Considered, therefore, as an examination system, the State examinations represent a different standard from the college examinations. The second difference lies in the further fact that the State credentials are really of the nature of certificates.

The College Entrance Board reports the ratings given by its readers on the applicant's papers and leaves the college to judge of his fitness to do college work; the Education Department certi-

fies that the student has passed its tests and naturally desires that the student should be accepted upon its certificate. Under such an organization is it possible for the colleges to exercise any of their responsibility of examination? I have said that an efficient certificate system is still an examination system. It is a substitution of the examination of the school for the examination of the applicant. Now, is it possible for a college to exercise that power and responsibility of examination when it receives students on the certification of a State Department?

Perhaps you will permit me to put right here a parenthesis, which shall be an acknowledgment on my part of the clear purpose of the department at Albany, under its present administration, to make its certificate as valuable as any certificate can possibly be, and I believe that the department will welcome every move on the part of the colleges in the direction of co-operation, and certainly will not resent any effort of the colleges to exercise their proper function of examination of the course of study which has led up to the test on the basis of which the students are sent up to the colleges. But at present, with the organization of the colleges as it is, that examination is not made, and it is difficult to see how it could be effectively carried out.

Now, with these weaknesses attaching to the certificate system as practiced by our colleges, the question becomes urgent, is there a remedy for the evils, or must we regard them as fundamental? For myself, I do not believe that the difficulties are essential; I believe that there is so positive an advantage to be gained if we can examine the schools before our acceptance of principals' credentials upon knowledge of the schools' work that it is very well worth while to seek to accomplish that good end. And the means to that end, I believe, have been outlined for us in the work which has been done and is now being done by the New England College Entrance Certificate Board.

I shall not undertake to outline to you at this time the work of that board, for it will be put before you with authority by a man much more competent to speak. I will simply call attention to the fact that it suggests that if all colleges in our Association that receive students by certificate could get together, unite their interests and work as a body, it would be possible for us to accomplish the thing which in some measure we have failed to do. What is the difficulty which lies in the path of such examination

of schools by the detached college? In the first place, it is a difficulty of expense. In order that such examination of schools should be thorough, constant and effective the college must be ready to send some member of its Faculty about the States covered by our Association to visit the schools from which the students come to that particular college. He must take the time to acquaint himself specifically with the kind of work that these schools are doing. Such inspection would be a serious drain upon the teaching force of the smaller college; it would be a serious drain upon the financial resources of the smaller college. That it can be done by a publicly supported institution, like one of the State universitites, is no evidence that it would be practically carried out by the smaller colleges of an association like this.

Another difficulty is that if these colleges independently send their inspectors to the different schools, these schools may possibly come into a sad perplexity because of the failure of the inspectors to conduct their work with consistency or uniformity of ideals, and the principals that certify to several of the colleges may find themselves in much the same perplexity that other principals have experienced from the indefinitions of college requirements. Moreover, I fear that that kind of inspection would practically vitiate itself by contradictions and mutual cancellations. There would be good in it, because the schools would be conscious that they are being held up to a standard. It would not be the highest good. The difficulty of expense and the difficulty of confusion make it problematical whether it will be possible for us as separate colleges so to bring the certificate system under check and scrutiny as to maintain effectively the standard of adequate preparation for admission to college.

Another thing that ought to be done that theoretically is not done, although it practically is done by many of us in a measure, is the notification of schools from whom students come to us on certificate concerning the work their students do in college. If the school in a given town sends three or four or a dozen boys to Rochester by certificate, and the principal congratulates himself that he has put so many boys into the college and then no longer interests himself in whether or not those students prove that they can do advanced mathematics or go on with Latin, the examination of the school is defective. He must get a report on

the success of his students, precisely as the individual applicant is notified of the success or failure of his effort to meet the test on examination. The colleges should send to these schools, consistently and regularly, the report of the quality of the work which their students have done in these different colleges.

We try to do it at Rochester every year. At the conclusion of the first freshman term, every school that had sent us students by certificate is notified concerning the standards of all the students sent to us by that school, not only those who failed, but those who succeeded, in order that the school may measure up and see whether its work is actually preparing students for college. Then the principal can judge whether the failure is due to its mistake in judgment in certifying a given student, or is due to the failure of the school adequately to prepare students who are intellectually competent for college work, or whether the student has changed the character of his work in the new environment. These things must be done if the certification method is to be successful as a means of admission of students to college.

Now, there is a reason, on which I have hardly touched, why we cannot offhand, without further consideration, dismiss certification of students for college and adopt in its place the old, and, from one point of view, more satisfactory method of admission by examination. There is an urgency making itself more and more clear to us from the standpoint of the schools, an urgency that barriers between the high schools and the colleges must be broken down. It is well enough for some of the older, larger and, in a sense, more popular colleges to say, "It is a matter of indifference to us whether the graduate of the regular high school can pass readily into our classes or not." From the point of view of self-interest of a majority of the colleges it is not a matter of indifference, and I am frank to confess for myself that from the point of view of the educational interests of a community it is not a matter of indifference. It is desirable that those who are ready and able to pass from grammar to high school should make the transition without sudden break or severe tax; so also it is desirable that those students who, finishing the high school, may desire to go on into college should make the transition without sudden break or serious tax, provided the college can perform its supreme duty of declaring that only such

students may be so received as are competent to do college work. Therefore, anything which will reduce the artificial barrier and set up in its place simply the essential requirement in the transition of students from our public high schools to our colleges contributes, it seems to me, to the efficiency and the unification and the cohesion of our educational system as a whole.

For that reason, if for no other, I find great interest in the problem of rendering the certification system as efficient as it may be; and I find that this interest reinforces and intensifies the conviction that if the examination of the schools can be conducted adequately and conscientiously and continuously, so that a Faculty may know that the school from which students come into its halls is competent to fit students and to judge of their fitness, they have a better test of preparation for college than any test the Faculty itself may set up at its own doors. That test is better, as experience is always better than casual acquaintance can be; better, because the individual character and traits of the student can be considered in the recommendation, while the individual power may be entirely obscured under what is often an entirely accidental ability or inability to pass a given test under the examination system.

Now, because in my judgment the certification system does point in the direction of a closer cohesion, a more perfect interchange of relations, a more ready opening of the path for our youth into college life, I believe earnestly in the certification system as distinct from the examination system; and that belief is justified in my mind only on the conviction that it is possible and therefore obligatory on us to make the certification system as exacting, make its insistence upon high standards as relentless as any separate examination system can be.

The things I have said lead up inevitably to an incomplete argument. I leave the argument incomplete for the reason already intimated—that we are to hear this afternoon about the effort which has been made in another section of the country to organize and strengthen the certification system by maintaining satisfactory standards of efficiency in the schools that send students to the college by certificate. Hence, I feel that it would be an impertinence for me to outline more in detail the method of that Association, or to express an opinion at this time

upon the work of that Association, for we are to have the opportunity of hearing from the President of the work of the New England College Entrance Certificate Board concerning the experience of the colleges that the members of that Association.

If we can, in our situation, do something similar to that which they have done in New England, I regard the admission by certificate as better policy and as offering in itself the possibility of surer tests than any admission by separate examinations can furnish.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COLLEGE ENTRANCE CERTIFICATE BOARD.

PROF. EDWIN S. CRAWLEY, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

The report which I am about to read is the report of the Committee of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, appointed to consider the resolution referred to this association, which was adopted at the Williamstown Conference, August 4, 1906, and which was worded as follows:

"*Resolved,* That this conference recommends to the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland and to the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States that each consider the desirability of organizing a college entrance certificate board or a commission for accrediting schools."

To the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland:

Your committee appointed to consider the resolution quoted above held a meeting in Philadelphia on February 9, 1907, and passed resolutions which, expressed in the form of recommendations to the association, are as follows:

(1) The committee recommends the establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board for the district covered by this association.

(2) That this board shall be composed of representatives of both colleges and preparatory schools, the college representation to be in the majority.

(3) That after being formed, this board shall continue its existence as an organization independent of this organization.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) WILLIAM R. CRABBE,
WILSON FARRAND,
THOMAS S. FISKE,
JOHN B. VAN METER,
EDWIN S. CRAWLEY.

Mr. President, if you will permit, I should like to say a few words further as to the reasons which led the committee to present its report in this form.

Taking conditions as we find them, the question before us is how to administer the certificate system most efficiently. It was with this administrative side of the question and with that alone which your committee had to deal. It would seem plausible that if the question of accrediting schools can be placed in the hands of an impartial board or commission, a distinct advance would be made in the direction of securing fair treatment to school, college, and student alike. At the meeting of the Association of American Universities in 1902 in the discussion held at that meeting upon the question of "The Certificate Method of Admission to Colleges and Universities," Prof. Thomas S. Fiske, of Columbia University, said: "One might say that the high schools of California are a part of the university system of California, and the acceptance of the certificate of a high school is almost the same as the acceptance of the certificate from a teacher in the institution itself. Such conditions we cannot attain to on the Atlantic coast. We might approximate them by establishing a great syndicate composed of all the more important colleges and universities, and, by means of this syndicate, administer a certificate system." If you adopt the report which has been read you will be taking the first step toward carrying out for this district the suggestion made by Professor Fiske in 1902.

In order to obtain some idea of the attitude of the members of the association at large upon this question, a letter was sent early in December, 1906, to each college or school having membership in the association asking for its opinion as to the advisability of establishing such a board or commission as had been proposed, and for suggestions as to the form that it should take if it be established. Up to the time of the meeting of the committee, seventy-eight replies were received, of which a very large majority were in favor of carrying out the proposed plan. The exact figures were as follows: From colleges, twenty-one replies were received, of which sixteen were favorable, four expressed uncertainty, and one was unfavorable. From schools, fifty-seven replies were received, of which forty-five were favorable, four uncertain, and eight unfavorable. In some cases opposition

to the plan was based upon opposition in general to the certificate system of admission to college. This, of course, was begging the question. We have the certificate system, whatever may be its merits or defects, and we are likely to have it for some time to come. The question, as was stated above, is how can we best administer this system.

It is no doubt well known to the members of this association that there are in existence at the present time at least two organizations of the same character as that which is here proposed, the New England College Entrance Certificate Board and the Commission on Accredited Schools of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. It is possible that other organizations of the same character exist in other parts of the country. The plans upon which these two organizations are formed are quite different. The New England Board is an independent body, composed exclusively of colleges, the number of members being at present thirteen, including Amherst, Boston University, Bowdoin, Brown, Maine, Wellesley, Wesleyan, and Williams. The North Central Commission is not an independent body, but is a permanent committeee of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and is composed of representatives of colleges and secondary schools in equal number.

Both of these associations have been in successful operation a sufficient length of time to test the efficiency of such a general system of accrediting schools. Upon the results which have been obtained in New England, I cannot do better than quote some passages from a letter which I received from Dr. Nathaniel F. Davis, of Brown University, secretary of the New England board. Doctor Davis states that since the board began its work the number of failures amongst students admitted to college on certificate has been reduced one-half. He says also: "We are exercising a very healthful influence on all the schools in New England. The principals are much more careful about granting certificates. Where the schools are not up to the standard, the authorities in many instances are doing their best to improve them, by increasing the number of teachers and the equipment.

"I think I can say without question that it is giving satisfaction to the colleges concerned. We commenced with only eight members, and we now have thirteen. Unless something of this kind

had been inaugurated, I think the certificate system in many of these colleges would have been abandoned, to the great injury of education.

"If a board similar to our own should be adopted I trust some way can be arranged for co-operation between the two."

I have no detailed information from the North Central Commission, but the secretary has written me strongly upholding the principle underlying such organizations.

You will recall that the second and third portions of the committee's report make certain recommendations regarding the constitution of the commission. It was considered advisable to make these recommendations so that, should the association act favorably upon the first part of this report, there would be some definite plan of organization for the association to consider without loss of time. As will be seen from what has been said of the organization of the New England Board and the North Central Commission, the committee recommends a form of organization which differs in some respect from both of these. Thus, it recommends that the board or commission be independent, which is true of the New England Board, but is not true of the North Central Commission, and it recommends the representation on the board of both schools and colleges, which is in conformity with the plan of the western commission, but not of the New England Board. It may be stated further that the commmittee was in favor of a plan whereby the colleges should have a majority of the representation on the board—in other words, an organization quite similar to that of the College Entrance Examination Board.

Having said this much in explanation of the committee's report, I should like to ask your indulgence for a few moments longer for the purpose of advancing certain considerations which seem to me to be pertinent to the question. As has been stated, the question which the committee had to consider was not one of the relative desirability of the admission to college by certificate, as against admission by examination, but the question of what could be done to improve the administration of the certificate system in this district. All colleges which admit upon certificate, and this method is practiced by the greater number of colleges in the Middle States and Maryland, must maintain for themselves some sort of list of approved or accredited schools

from which they receive students on certificate. Practically all who have to look after the details of such arrangements admit the great difficulty of keeping on this list only those schools which should properly belong to it. The removal of a school from such a list, while theoretically a very easy matter, is one that will be taken by the individual college only in extreme cases. The function of the commission or board will be to take this whole matter out of the hands of the colleges and relieve them of what is now a burden and an annoyance. It will ensure to the college admitting on certificate a better grade of students; it will place the stronger preparatory schools in a better position by relieving them of the pressure of weak individuals clamoring for certificates which they feel they can secure from a school of less exacting standards, and it will act as a spur to the weaker schools to place themselves in a position to secure the board's approval. In all ways, therefore, it must work for higher efficiency in secondary education.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

PROF. JOHN K. LORD, DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, PRESIDENT OF THE NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE ENTRANCE CERTIFICATE BOARD.—I am asked to present to you this afternoon a statement of facts having to do with the New England College Entrance Certificate Board, dealing with three points: the organization of the board, the methods of the board, and the results of its work.

The occasion of its establishment was, as President Rhees has said, the dissatisfaction with the then administration of the certificate system in New England. The certificate system had been in vogue for a long time, and the difficulties of its administration arose in the colleges themselves, and in the schools. The difficulties in the colleges arose from the fact that there was a lax administration of the system, due, undoubtedly, in part, to the idea to which President Rhees referred, namely, that colleges in their competition one with another were afraid to enforce the system as on paper it was stated. Every college, for instance, stated that schools approved might send their pupils on certificate to the colleges, but that schools which did not send well-fitted

students should be dropped from the list. As a matter of fact, it was very rare indeed that a school was dropped from the list, the reason being, undoubtedly, in part, that one college did not wish to put itself at a disadvantage with other colleges which might draw from that school, and also in part from the fact that there was no direct and immediate supervision of the schools on the part of the colleges.

On the side of the schools an objection arose to the certificate system that many of the teachers did not believe in the certificate system, avowing themselves, openly, supporters of the examination system, and with equal frankness stating that all their students would be sent to college, as far as possible, on examination, and that they would give certificates to the weak ones and not to the well-prepared, and that their students would go on certificate only when they could not pass examinations—which, of course, was an injury to the students, and to the college as well.

That being the state of affairs, it seemed very desirable that something should be done on the part of the colleges to remedy it, if possible—to remedy their own shortcomings and to remedy the shortcomings in the schools. The matter first came to discussion through the action of the Commission of Colleges in New England on Admission Examinations, an organization established about 1885 for the express purpose of attempting as far as possible to make uniformity of examinations admitting to college, as far as requirements were the same. The work of that commission was a very effective one; but it had very largely finished its work by the end of the 90's; and although it had on its representation colleges like Harvard and Yale (which did not admit students on certificate), the question of admission by certificate came before it, though mainly in the form of the ununiformity of certificates. The schools complaining that the certificates required by the different colleges were different and that much unnecessary labor and at some points much hardship was entailed by the variety of certificates, a committee was appointed by this commission to investigate the character of the certificates and to report. The investigation of that committee led it very decidedly to the belief that the trouble lay not so much with the form of the certificates as it did with the approval of the schools, and that when emphasis was laid upon the form

of the certificate, or even the character of the certificate, as related to the individual students, the emphasis was laid in the wrong place, and that it ought to be put upon the approval of the schools; and that a school which was itself approved should be the proper judge of the student whom it should send to the college, and that the college should not inquire whether A, or B, or C, members of a school which had been properly approved, were adequately prepared for college, but whether the principal of the school considered that they were prepared for college, the examination having been made of the school and not of the individual.

On the report of the committee, the commission of colleges voted that a recommendation be made to the colleges represented on that commission which received students by certificate to establish a board for the examination or the approval of schools. As the result of that recommendation (the proposition being definitely put before the colleges), eight colleges accepted the recommendation and appointed delegates to meet, consider a definite plan, and report to the colleges if in their judgment it was wise for the colleges to establish such a board as the commission suggested. The delegates from eight colleges met and made a recommendation for the establishment of the board, which was accepted by the colleges, and the board was established.

It was a condition precedent that the colleges should give up the right of approving schools and of accepting certificates from any schools which were not approved by this central board, and all the colleges concurring in the establishment of this central board agreed that after a given date they would receive no pupils from schools in New England which were not approved; the board did not undertake to extend its examinations outside of New England.

When the board was established the question came definitely before it, how it should examine the schools and on what ground its approval should be given. Two courses seemed to be open to it: one was to appoint an examining officer whose business it should be to go about among the schools and find out by his observation the character of the schools. That was strongly urged by some members of the board. The objections to it were, first, its expense, as has been said by President Rhees; the colleges then included in the board not thinking that they could

endure the expense of such an officer, which would run up into the thousands of dollars a year. That difficulty was in itself apparently sufficient; but in addition to it, there was the second difficulty (to some, at least) that the board, by the appointment of such an officer, would practically become a one-man power; that if a commissioner or an examiner went about among the schools and reported against a certain school, no matter what the colleges thought, the board itself would not go against the recommendation of that officer; if, on the contrary, he reported in favor of a school, it would be very difficult to turn down the recommendation; and the result was, that for those two reasons the board abandoned, or did not adopt, the method of appointing a single examiner.

The other course was to find out, as far as possible, what the schools had done in the administration of the certificate system; and therefore every college which was represented on the board was asked to send to the board a statement of the preparation, as indicated by the work done for the first term or the first semester in college, of every student that had come from a school in New England for the preceding three years on certificate. When the board had those reports before it, it was able to examine what the results of the certificate system had been from the different schools for three years preceding. In addition to that, the board sent out to each school that applied for approval a circular asking it to give definitely the statement of its work and its equipment, including the number of teachers, its libraries, laboratories, its opportunities for efficient instruction, and its course of study. When the replies had been received they were given into the charge of a Committee on Schools (as it was called), which made a very careful examination of every school; first, on its printed report of what it did, and, second, as to what it had done in the use of the certificate privilege; and taking those two things together, the Committee on Schools made a report to the board at its first annual meeting recommending certain schools for approval and recommending that others be not approved.

The recommendation for approval was based on the statement of the curriculum of the school and the facilities of the school and the number of teachers, supported by the record of the school in sending students to college on certificate who had successfully met the requirements of the colleges. Any school

whose course of study and whose facilities were not sufficient was not recommended. Any school whose course of study appeared to be sufficient was not recommended, provided in the preceding three years its recommendations of students by certificate had not proved acceptable to the colleges. I may say here, however, that the board did not attempt, and never has attempted, to establish any standard of school curriculum. It has not even gone so far as to state that there must be a certain number of teachers—graduates of colleges—as the teachers in the schools. As a matter of fact, I believe it never has accepted a school which had less than three college graduates on its board of teachers, though it does not make that statement absolutely, thinking it better not to establish a certain point which never could be passed over if it were found desirable to pass over it.

It never has attempted to set a standard curriculum. It has often been asked by the schools: "Will you suggest to us what we should do in order to improve our curriculum?" or, "Will you suggest to us a desired curriculum?" The board has invariably said: "It is not our business to establish the curriculum of the schools. You have before you the requirements of the colleges for admission; they vary somewhat; you have them before you and you are to establish your own course of study from what you read in the requirements of the colleges. But if, in our judgment, you cannot prepare for a college in any one of its courses, you cannot be approved; but we make no recommendation whatever of a standard curriculum."

The board was established by the delegates of the several colleges of which I have spoken. Each college was represented by a delegate, who held his office for three years. Any college receiving students by certificate in New England might become a member of the board on accepting the action of the board, and also saying that it would receive no students except from the schools approved by the board. The schools applying for approval very soon found that they could not be approved if the work which their pupils had done had been unsatisfactory, and many of them were, of course, disappointed in the results which followed the first report of the board. Some of the schools had been sending pupils to college by certificate, and it was found that the pupils had not done satisfactory work. Those schools were rejected and, of course, some of them felt very much hurt,

and they felt hurt on this ground: that they had not supposed, before the establishment of this board, that the certificate meant very much, and now they felt sorry that they had given certificates on insufficient information; but the insufficient information had been in their own power, and it seemed as if they ought to stand for what they had done. The rules that were adopted by the board for the guidance of the schools, I think, I can do no better than in general to read:

"IV. No school will be approved unless it has shown by the record of its students already admitted to college its ability to give thorough preparation for college.

V. Schools which have been rejected because of the poor record of students sent to college on certificate, or which have been dropped from the list of approved schools for cause, must send within a period of three years at least three satisfactory students to one or more colleges represented on the board before a new application for approval will be considered.

VI. Schools, other than those referred to in Rule V, must send within a period of three years at least two satisfactory students to one or more colleges represented on the board before an application for approval will be considered.

VII. A school shall be judged by the record of students who have entered college with the consent of its principal."

If a principal sends us a boy, or lets a boy come, and says, "I have no objection to his being examined; he has been through the school; he has graduated; I won't recommend him, but I am willing he should try," and the college takes him, the college is responsible for him, and the school, if he fails, is not to be held responsible, because the principal has not recommended him. I quote again:

"XI. The certificate privilege of a school, whether it be on the trial list or on the list of fully approved schools, shall not be continued beyond the period for which it was approved without a formal application on behalf of the school.

A school on the approved list may apply before April 1st of the last year of the period for which it was approved for a renewal of the certificate privilege for a further period of three years, and its application shall be considered at the annual meeting immediately following.

A school which has been on the approved list, and which does

not apply for the renewal of the certificate privilege before April 1st of the calendar year following the expiration of the period for which it was approved, shall forfeit the privilege of renewal, and its application for approval shall be treated in the same way as that of a school applying for the first time."

That is, once on does not *keep* the school on; but at the end of three years the school must reapply in order to be considered. It will not be continued on the list simply by gravitation. It will be dropped out by gravitation.

"XII. A school which has been on the approved list, and which within the three years has not sent any pupil on certificate to a college represented on the board, cannot have its certificate privilege renewed, and an application for approval shall be treated in the same way as if it came from a school which had never been approved.

XIII. The board shall have the power of withdrawing approval from a school, and from such a school certificates shall not afterward be accepted until it shall have been approved again by the board."

That is, the board shall withdraw at any time the approval from any school for cause.

"XIV. Certificates coming from any school approved by the board, and covering all the requirements for admission made by any college represented on the board, shall be valid at such college, and certificates that do not so cover the entire requirements shall be treated by each college according to the rules which that college establishes for such certificates. No certificate from a school not approved by this board shall be valid for admission at any co-operating college unless the school lies outside the jurisdiction of the board."

Different colleges represented on the board deal with partial certificates in different ways. That privilege is not taken away from the colleges, but they must receive pupils coming by certificate from schools that are approved.

How does the board keep track of the schools?

"XV. A general report of the work of pupils from approved schools for at least one-third of their first year in college shall be made to the board, and such other reports as the board may require, and all complaints of insufficient preparations shall be made to the board with specifications as to subjects and indi-

viduals, but such complaints shall not interfere with reports to the schools about students entering from them."

That really is the backbone of the work of the board. Every year it receives from the colleges the report of every student entering from New England, either by certificate or examination; by certificate, in order to keep track of the schools that are approved; by examination, in order to keep track of those schools which may apply, but which have not thus far been approved. When the board receives those reports it makes a careful analysis of them, and if any approved school is found to be sending pupils who have not proved satisfactory to the college that school at once is warned.

There are two kinds of warnings sent. One is a simple statement that "You as a school—you as a principal—sent so many pupils to college this year on certificate"; three, five—the number makes no difference; "and so many were unsatisfactory." If there were five pupils, we will say twenty-five subjects, and out of those twenty-five subjects certified three were unsatisfactory, nothing further than that fact is said; the attention of the school is simply called to the fact that a small proportion is unsatisfactory. If, however, the failures were all in one subject, it becomes pretty evident that the school is weak in that subject, and that fact is noted in the warning. If, for instance, there were failures in mathematics, in Latin, or in English—it makes no difference what the subject is, sometimes they are in one, sometimes another—that fact is called to the attention of the school, with no further comment. But if the failures are more than a few in number, or if they follow in successive years, then what is called the second warning is sent to the school, namely, that it is doing unsatisfactory work and that it is in great danger of being dropped from the approved list, and that danger is a real one.

At the meeting last summer of the National Conference Committee of the Associations of Colleges and Preparatory Schools this resolution was passed: "*Resolved,* That this committee recommends that both the inspection of the preparatory schools and the record made in college during the first term or semester of the freshman year by the pupils from such schools be the basis for granting the accrediting or the certificate privilege." It came from the discussion of the practice of the western institutions and the eastern institutions, the western institutions making

examination of schools by members of their faculties or by somebody representing the institutions, and the eastern considering only the work of pupils during their first term or semester in college. The recommendation was that the two methods be united as far as possible.

What is the result of this? I think the facts speak for themselves.

As nearly as I can remember, about 550 schools in New England were on the approved list of the different colleges before the board was established. About two-thirds of those applied to the board for approval during the first year, and probably a hundred of them have not applied at all, indicating that their equipment was insufficient, or that, owing to the small number of pupils which they had sent to college, they could not apply.

This is the record of the last year:

During the year ending with the annual meeting in May, 1907, twenty (20) schools, which had been previously rejected by the board, again applied for approval. Of these, six (6) were ineligible by Rule V and fourteen (14) were placed on the trial list for one year. Thirty (30) schools applied for the first time for the approval of the board. Of these, six (6) were placed on the trial list for one year, one (1) was refused on account of its poor record, one (1) was refused because its curriculum was unsatisfactory, and twenty-two (22) were refused because they were ineligible by Rule VI. Of the twenty-two (22) two (2) presented also unsatisfactory curricula. Of the forty-four (44) schools on the trial list for last year three (3) were refused a continuation of the privilege, twenty (20) were continued on the trial list, two (2) were approved for one year, attention being called to poor records in one or two subjects; one (1) was approved for two years, and eighteen (18) were fully approved and placed on the list for three years from January 1st, 1907. Of the one hundred and forty (140) schools on the aproved list whose approval expired December 31st, 1906, one hundred and thirty-six (136) had requested that their certificate privilege might be extended for a further period of three years. The request was granted in the case of one hundred and fourteen (114), while in the case of fifteen (15) schools the approval of the board was extended until January 1st, 1908.

The remaining seven (7) schools were dropped from the list, five (5) because of poor records and two (2) because neither had sent a student on certificate within the three years to a college connected with the board.

I think that indicates pretty clearly that the board exercises very definite supervision over the schools and that a school is not continued on the approved list unless it has met very definitely the requirements of the colleges.

A word as to the pupils themselves. What has been the result of the operation of the board as far as a comparison of statements can show? The last annual report of the board contains the following table:

	English	Latin	Greek	French	German	Mathematics
Number examined, 1906-07	333	254	66	245	146	388
Number failed 1st term, 1906-07	27	16	6	17	12	61
Per cent. failed 1st term, 1906-07	8.1	6.3	9.1	7.	8.2	15.7
Per cent. failed 1st term, 1905-06	8.8	2.8	4.1	5.	8.8	15.1
Per cent. failed 1st term, 1904-05	5.5	2.7	4.2	6.5	10.	13.1
Number certified in 1906-07	1,021	807	274	757	478	940
Number failed 1st term, 1906-07	86	32	8	44	14	127
Per cent. failed 1st term, 1906-07	8.4	4.	2.9	5.8	2.9	13.5
Per cent. failed 1st term, 1905-06	7.4	3.7	2.5	6.3	4.3	10.6
Per cent. failed 1st term, 1904-05	9.5	4.4	1.9	8.8	7.8	12.8
Per cent. unsatisfactory, 1903-04*	20.2	14.	11.8	14.	13.4	24.6

That is, on the whole, just about the proportion of one-third as many unsatisfactory now as under the former system. This is the result of the work of the board, as it thus far has been brought to record, plainly showing that the articulation between the schools and the colleges is much closer than it was before, and that the value of the certificate has greatly risen under this careful supervision by the board.

THE PRESIDENT.—The subject is now open for discussion. This discussion may take the widest range, because it may concern the general question of the desirability of a system of certificate, or the desirability of systematizing admission by certificate where it has been established. It is true, as Professor Crawley has said, that to object to the systematization on the ground of objecting to certificates on principle is to beg the

*The last year before the formation of the approved list.

question, but that is so common a human method that we need not pay any attention to that objection. Moreover, there is a certain force in the objection on principle. When you make an undesirable thing convenient you adjourn your scruples of principle, and therefore it does not seem to me entirely begging the question to object to the systematization of an undesirable thing (if you think it undesirable) for the sake of not obscuring its undesirability.

On these various grounds, therefore, more or less ingenuous, the chair feels justified in allowing this discussion to take the widest possible range. I would be pleased to recognize any one who wishes to continue the discussion.

PRINCIPAL WILLIAM W. BIRDSALL.—I would like to ask how the expense of the commission is borne.

PROFESSOR LORD.—It is borne by a tax upon the colleges, proportionate to the number of students received on certificate from New England by each. Last year it was (if I recall) 65 cents for each student received on certificate. The expenses of the board are mainly the expense of the secretary's salary, which is $500, the expense of the meeting and the expense of printing; all told, the expense of the year is about $800 at present.

PROF. JULIUS SACHS, TEACHERS' COLLEGE.—This is a very important question, and, as action may be called for sooner or later, I think we ought to look at the matter in all its bearings. I believe, as Professor Lord has shown, that there is an approach to articulation between the schools—the preparatory schools—and the college. Whether it has taken the most fortunate form for the schools I am inclined to question. For instance, as his exposition advanced I could not help having this thought constantly in mind: Is the test that is carried out by the colleges a right one? Does it include real investigation of the schools?

As I understand it, the test is determined by the conduct and the performance of the students during the first three months, or the first term of the year, under conditions which are radically different from those to which they were subjected at their schools. It is a well-known fact, which every teacher has expe-

rienced, that students who have done exceedingly well in schools, when brought face to face with new conditions, collapse, prove weak. Schools are tested mainly, if not solely, by the performance of their students under these new conditions. Why, one might ask the colleges to revise the results of their entrance examinations because students whom they had accepted as satisfactory students upon entrance examinations turned out very badly in the course of the first term. I don't know that this is done. Is this, indeed, a proper investigation of the schools? If Professor Lord will pardon the expression, it begs the question of investigating or not investigating fully.

There is only one method, it seems to me, of investigating the schools, and that is investigating them in operation. That is the system of the western institutions, and it is well known that where that method is carried out fully the results are satisfactory; at all events, statistics have shown that the standing of the students admitted under certification is fully as good as that of the students admitted on examination. As complete an investigation of the schools in their work as possible is desirable, but that will have to be carried out through different means. It will certainly involve a much larger expense than has been indicated here as the expense of this board, but it is the only way of determining whether the schools are doing efficient work.

There are other features of this scheme which strike one who has been connected with the work as unjust. Why should a school, because it has for two or three successive years not sent its students to this group of colleges, be eliminated from the list of colleges, if its record was previously found good? Has its record deteriorated during that time? Not to the knowledge of these investigators. It has simply not come into contact with them. And so one might point out quite a number of points of weakness in this system. I have no doubt it is one way of reaching conclusions, but it still does not seem to be the final way of determining what many still believe desirable: a full investigation of the excellence of each school in its performance, an investigation frequent, not at one given time, but carried out every couple of years; for schools deteriorate; good teachers are withdrawn and replaced by poor ones; a good principal may be replaced by a weak principal. Some method will have to be found, and the suggestion in Professor Crawley's paper indicates

another way which may prove in the end a solution: by a scheme —I think he called it by that name—a scheme of colleges who divide the work of rigid investigation of schools amongst themselves. These colleges certainly could co-operate and delegate the investigation of one particular subject to a representative from one college, and such investigation ought to be acceptable to all the syndicating colleges; and so, if a dozen or half a dozen colleges co-operated in that way and passed upon the respective merits of schools in frequent tests in mathematics, natural sciences, in Latin, etc., the united verdict would be a powerful tribute to the excellence of the school. It is the work of the school in operation, not what its students afterwards do at college, that should be the determining factor.

PRESIDENT THOMAS FELL, ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE.—After I had listened to the very lucid exposition made by President Rhees I felt that there was little more to be said upon the subject, but it has occurred to me that perhaps it might be well for a representative of a college not in the State of New York to say something about the difficulties of the situation as presented in one of the other States.

Very curiously, this question came up before the faculty of my own college in Maryland last year. At that time we almost unanimously accepted the plan of admitting to the freshmen class, without examination, students who presented certificates of graduation from various high schools and also from some private schools in the State.

The faculty, when they assembled in October of this year, seemed to be almost as unanimous in their disposition to cancel the agreement with these schools, the result of their experience of the previous year not having been satisfactory, and if the matter had been allowed to go to a vote it would have been so decided; but they were prevailed upon to appoint a committee to ascertain the experience and practice of the colleges which stood more particularly in relation to ourselves.

Now, President Rhees has very justly said that the element of competition comes very largely into the consideration of the question, and when it was learned that nearly all the colleges and universities with which we come into competition accepted certificates as a basis for the admission of students it was felt

that it was better to act with caution on the proposition to discontinue the recognition of certificates for the future.

Then the question arose as to what could be done. Among other suggestions it was proposed to send examination papers during the month of May to the principals of the various high schools in the State of Maryland, and to invite them to submit these entrance examination questions to such candidates as might be intending to enter college.

This did not seem to be at all a reasonable or practicable proposition, because there are relatively few boys among the graduates of a high school who desire to enter college, and in the competition that arises to secure these few boys it would appear rather questionable policy to ask the principal of any high school to give an examination for entrance to St. John's College when probably the boys could go to any other college on certificates.

The whole question was surrounded with difficulty, and was, for the present, laid on the table.

In Maryland there is a Board of State Education which examines the high schools and declares which schools are deemed satisfactory. The dictum of this board as to what schools may be considered up to the standard is universally accepted by the colleges of the State.

Referring, therefore, to the resolution before us, that a board be established by this association to examine and certify as to the standing of all high schools, private and preparatory schools, I beg to say that the proposition meets with my highest approval.

THE PRESIDENT.—I would ask Professor Lord, in determining whether the students certified have succeeded, what is your duty, merely to ascertain that they have passed, or do you also examine whether they have passed well or not?

PROFESSOR LORD.—The test taken is simply whether they have passed. It is not whether they have passed well or ill, but whether they have met the passing mark of the several colleges. I would like to say a word, if I may, in reference to the points raised by Doctor Sachs, because I think they are important. The first point which he raised was that it was not fair to the schools to test their work by the work of pupils during their

first term or semester in college. I think he is justified in saying that, to a considerable extent; and the examination of the work of the pupils there is subject to the imperfections which attend all human activity—the error of judgment on the part of the college men and the change that takes place in the boy or girl by the change of environment from the school to the college. But on the whole it seems to the board a fair thing to say that "By their fruits ye shall know them," and that the work of the schools is fairly estimated by the work which the boys or girls do in the college when they first come from the schools.

However, if a college at any time thinks that the change has come in the work of the student from good to bad as the result of environment, it is noted in its report by the college, and every year reports are sent in to the board that this, that or the other person has shown unsatisfactory work, but the change in the work is thought to be the result of the change in environment, and such cases are not reckoned by the board against the school from which the pupil comes. They are not very many, it is true, but they do occur.

The other point made by Doctor Sachs was, as I understood, that it was not fair to a school to throw it out of the list because for three years it had not sent pupils to the colleges represented on the board. The board does not attempt to say at any time whether a school is a good or a bad school; it merely attempts to indicate what use a school has made of the certificate privilege; and if it has not made any use of the certificate privilege, as far as these colleges know, for three years, it is fair to the colleges to say that they have no means of judging the value of that school's certificate. For this same reason the colleges in the board have refused steadily to take into consideration the work done by pupils sent to other colleges, because they have no means of following up their work and of judging of it, and if pupils enter other colleges on examination their work, even if it could be followed up, has no bearing on the quality of the certificate which would be given by the schools from which they come, and yet this is the one thing on which the board lays stress. If, therefore, a school has sent no pupil to college for three years, or none to a college where its certificate comes under the inspection of the board, it seems fair that the school should not receive the certificate privilege.

PRINCIPAL VIRGIL PRETTYMAN, HORACE MANN HIGH SCHOOL.—I simply wish to make specific some of the things that I think Doctor Sachs must have had in mind when he used the words "new environment." We naturally think of the new conditions of life surrounding the student entering college; we let those pass. There is one thing we do know, that in many cases the student passes from the instruction of a high school master who is an expert, and in the freshmen year, certainly in many of our colleges, he frequently comes under the instruction of inexperience; he is not brought up and held responsible by the young college instructor as he has been by his master in the high school. I for one do not want the work of my school judged by the young man who feels that it shows wisdom to flunk three-fourths of his class, and it happens in very many cases.

PRINCIPAL JAMES M. GREEN, NEW JERSEY STATE NORMAL SCHOOL.—Our President has said we may discuss rather freely at this time any phase of the afternoon's programme. I should like to say that I strongly favor the certificating system, as I always have. There is one phase of this discussion which needs further clarification. We use the words "college preparatory," and seem to imply that all secondary education is directly in preparation for college, but such is not the case.

Commissioner Draper, some time since, in an address in Illinois, stated in effect that the public high school was in a singular manner the expression of the needs of the people. This is true. The public high schools are governed by boards of education chosen by the people, hence they are singularly susceptible to expressed needs, whether by the people directly or through their teachers as the interpreters of their wishes.

The people wish the secondary education to meet as nearly as possible the needs of practical life, as they term it; the demands of the industries. They wish their children to have such subjects as drawing, with its applications in the mechanics; physical training and hygiene, a more liberal course in American history than is required for college entrance, botany and zoology, with reference to horticulture and agriculture. If we are to be in favor with the people we must teach these subjects, but if we teach them properly we will get out of them an educational value that will enable the students to do the college work fully as well

as though they had spent their whole time on the college preparatory subjects, but they would not, in the nature of things, be as well prepared for an entrance examination.

The public high schools are a great and growing factor in the education of students who wish to go to college. Eighty per cent. in some of the New England colleges, and as high as 40 per cent. in some of the Middle States colleges, is enrolled from these schools. We want this percentage increased, because we believe in the advantages of the college education and believe that it is a fortunate sign when great numbers of the people are seeking these advantages. Anything that tends to decrease or remove artificial obstacles to entering college will tend to increase the enrollment. If these public high school students can take the classics and mathematics that are essential to going on with the college course, can also take the larger amount of work of a directly practical nature required of them, and have the educational development sufficient to carry the college course, together with a desire for that course, I submit that they should be admitted to the college.

This admission should be on certificate signed by the authorities of the school from which the pupil comes, and these authorities should be noted relative to the value of their certificates. If a pupil is to be examined on a set of questions prepared by persons who are total strangers to him, and who do not necessarily have his point of view, he becomes nervous and spends more time in trying to seek out the answers to possible questions that will be given him than in trying to learn his subject in his natural way, as directed by his teacher. This nervousness and seeking of probable questions on the part of the pupil is oftentimes shared by the teacher, who fears the disgrace of having her pupils conditioned, hence the pitiable exhibition of going over and over and over again the particular things that they think may occur in examination, the hunting for old sets of questions, etc., etc., rather than going confidently forward with the education of the pupil by taking him farther and farther, according to his time, in valuable subjects of learning.

One thing further. I do not think the reliability of the certificating school should be tested by the pupil's first term in college. It often requires more than this for a thorough readjustment. It could be safely tested by his first year.

THE PRESIDENT.—I am sorry to say I find it necessary to withdraw from this session. Before I withdraw I wish to explain the reason of my question to Professor Lord. I think that there is a matter which we should be more frank about, and which Doctor Rhees was extremely frank about. What vitiates this test as administered by this board, it seems to me, is our irrational desire in the colleges for numbers. The same things that would relax our vigilance as to the admission of students lower our standards as to the retention of students. And the fact that a man has passed his midyear examination, for example, does not prove that he was prepared to go to college. In other words, the argument turns in the direction indicated by Professor Sachs: we do not really know much about the schools by the fact that their pupils have or have not passed the midyear examinations.

Why our colleges should desire numbers I have never been able to discover. I mean, considering the question rationally. Why we should desire a large number of young men no one of whom is paying for his instruction, when a considerable proportion of those young men are insusceptible of being educated after our fashion, I do not understand, and that inordinate desire for numbers is leading to a great deal of ineffectual instruction in the universities. We are keeping down our standards of instruction in order to retain the men incapable of receiving a higher form of instruction, and now for several years our interest at Princeton has been to increase the casualty list at the examinations, not wishing the casualty to fall upon men who can pass them, but earnestly desiring that it may fall on those who cannot go through the term with credit to themselves and to the classes. Moreover, there is another thing which makes it desirable that we should examine the schools. I mean as operative organisms. A great many of the private schools (and the college which I represent draws chiefly from the private schools) have fallen of recent years into a very amiable weakness; they profess it to be their object to develop not scholars but gentlemen! Their objective is character, and they do not always insist that their boys should prove their character by doing their duty.

I remember being approached, just after the period of our entrance examinations one year, by a very excited gentleman,

who said that we had made a very great mistake in not receiving into our entering class an admirable young fellow from one of the private schools. I said: "Yes, I have heard of him. I have heard he was a lovely fellow." He said he was not only that; he was the leading spirit in his school and the leading spirit for good. "Yes," I said, "so I have understood; but he did not pass the entrance examinations." "Oh, well, but," he said, "I don't think you understand," and he went all over the manly excellencies of this lad. I said: "I beg your pardon, but I think it is you who do not understand; he did not *pass* the entrance examinations. Now," I said, "the only way we can determine whether a boy is or is not apt to waste his time is by using such imperfect tests as we have for ascertaining whether he knows how to go on with the work that he is here undertaking." I said (in a moment of hyperbole): "If the angel Gabriel were to apply for entrance here and could not pass the entrance examinations he would not be admitted; not because we should not desire the influence of his character, but because he would be wasting his time until he was prepared to go on with the course of study."

I remember on one occasion we committed the indiscretion of allowing a very active evangelist—religious evangelist—to come to the University only three weeks before the midyear examinations. He upset the whole college, and while some very well-intentioned young gentlemen were going about trying to get their friends out to the meetings they came upon one door securely fastened, and on the outside of it was this notice: "I am a Christian and studying for examination." The point of that is, that was a perfectly logical sequence of ideas; the particular thing which a Christian would have been doing at that time of year was not attending meetings, but studying for examination. I don't know any other way to develop character except to make a man attend to the business in hand.

I am of the belief that so long as our universities are not of that disposition and wish to retain numbers, you will not know by the fact that young gentlemen have passed, merely passed, the midyear examinations, whether the schools have prepared them for anything or not. This fundamental American weakness of a competitive desire for size vitiates this whole subject, and until we purge our consciences of that kind of offense

I do not see how we can get at the merits of a discussion like this. We have been ignoring our descent from Adam in the whole of this discussion. The old Adam is at the bottom of all errors that it seems to me we are guilty of.

I wish I might remain to hear some one destroy all that I have said, but, unhappily, an engagement makes it necessary that I should withdraw or else I shall not be able to join you again this evening, and if Mr. Marsh will be kind enough to take the chair, I will withdraw.

MR. WALTER R. MARSH, VICE-PRESIDENT, here took the chair.

DEAN W. H. CRAWSHAW, COLGATE UNIVERSITY.—This question is one that is highly important to the majority of the colleges and preparatory schools of this association. It is also an extremely practical question, and the first consideration is, how shall such a board as we are talking about be constituted? The report of the committee appears to have left much to be desired in definiteness on that point. It suggests that a board should be instituted of which a majority of the members should be representatives of the colleges, and of which a minority should be representatives of the preparatory schools. But it suggests nothing further than that. We should be very clear as to just what kind of a board we want, and the one particular point that I wish to make about that is that no single college in the association should be unrepresented on such a board. Each college has its problems; each college gets in touch with a large circle of preparatory schools; each college is prepared to contribute very largely to the work of such a board.

Still another thing. We seem to be moving in the direction of the creation of a number of boards of this character. We have the New England Board; we have another board that we have heard about this afternoon, and now we are proposing a third. Will not the question arise as to a system of reciprocity between these boards? Shall we not find ourselves forced, finally, by agreement between the different associations, to the constitution of a more general board somewhat after the fashion of the College Entrance Examination Board, which was started by this association, but which is now much more nearly national in its scope? Either that, or else each one of these separate

boards may have to take the responsibility of acquainting itself with the work of the other boards, and responsibility, also, for indicating the results of that acquaintance to the colleges which come within its circle, so that this board of ours will notify the colleges and preparatory schools within our circle of what schools are certificated, by the New England Board and by the other boards and recommend to this Association that it shall also recognize those. What, for instance, does the New England Board do with preparatory schools outside of New England? Some of the New England colleges do receive students from schools outside of New England, but they have no means of applying to these schools any such rules as their board establishes for schools in New England.

There is another point I wish to make which perhaps will raise a problem rather than afford helpful suggestion. It is this: We have heard something said about the articulation between the high school and the college. Now, as the last speaker before President Wilson said, there is in a certain sense a different aim on the part of the high school than the aim of preparation of students for college. The education which the public high school offers, as distinguished from that which the old-line academy used to offer, diverges from the straight line of preparation for college, and such a board as this, I think, will do a very great service, both to colleges and to preparatory schools, if it can in any way—I do not profess to see how it can be done, but if it can in any way—make that education which the high schools are offering point more directly in the direction of preparation for college. A specific point under that head is this: There are subjects well taught in the high schools to-day which serve all the purposes of education of young men for life, but which afford absolutely no basis on which a college can build higher instruction in those subjects. That is true in part of English. There we have the most general kind of preparation, no specific preparation. In mathematics the specific preparation is very good; in Latin it is good; in Greek it is good. In science the case is different. In chemistry we find that men who have had the one year in a high school go on into the laboratory in chemistry, but in physics they must practically begin a new course, and in geology and in biology practically the same state of affairs exists. In the modern languages the great difficulty is that the

students who have had two years in the secondary school are not prepared to do second-year work in the colleges. We have had the experience of having students come to us with Regents' certificate for one year of work in a modern language; they were to take the second year as an entrance condition. They took one term, three hours a week for about fourteen weeks, in college classes, and then went and passed the Regents' examination on the work of the second year. In other words, they passed the Regents' examination in second-year French or German on the basis of one term's work in college. The difficulty here is insufficient preparation, but in the other cases it lies in a preparation which, however well it may answer the purposes of the high school (I am speaking now from the point of view of the college)—however well it may serve the purposes of the high school or the general purposes of the student in the high school—does not serve very well the purposes of the college as a basis on which to build higher instruction in those subjects, and which makes it necessary for the college to begin at the beginning of those subjects and waste time which it does not need to waste where students come with a preparation, and a good preparation, in such subjects as mathematics and Latin and Greek. The more nearly we can come to placing the preparation in these other subjects on the same plane, as a basis for advanced work, that the preparation for mathematics and Latin and Greek is now on the better it will be, and I hope this board will be able to contribute something to the benefit of the colleges and preparatory schools in that direction, as well as in other directions.

Mr. William N. Marcy, The Mackenzie School.—I am sorry to have to intrude the ego, but I am forced to do so by a remark made last year by President Fell. I had ceased speaking; I was talking to President Fell, and he looked at me and said: "Well, Marcy, I don't see how a fellow of twenty-two has got the audacity to get up and speak in this august body." I had to explain to President Fell that I was not twenty-two, and that I had been teaching fifteen years, but one of the penalties of being clean shaven is that you may convey a false impression; so in self-defense I am obliged to say that at the outset of my remarks.

There are two vital reasons why some central board for cer-

tificating should be used. What, after all, is the real objection the colleges, or some of the colleges, have to a certificate? Two, as it seems to me. First, because they have not sufficient confidence in the integrity of the schools; or, second, because they throw up their hands and say: "Well, we should like to accept the certificate, but we have not got the time or opportunity to follow up the schools and see if they are doing the work that is necessary to fit their boys for college."

I believe in calling a spade a spade, and I would like to tell you a story of the late Bishop Wilberforce. He was traveling from Bristol to London, and unfortunately two laboring men got into the carriage and their language was not very polite; it was rather strong. Finally one of them spied the bishop, and he turned to him and said: "Bishop, I am very sorry that our language has been rather strong, but you know we believe in calling a spade a spade." The bishop looked at them quietly and said: "Gentlemen, judging from your language I should say you prefer to call it an infernal shovel." Now, that is just the position I am in to-day. I believe in calling a spade a spade; want of integrity on the part of the preparatory school is another name for dishonesty. That may be unpalatable to the preparatory schools of this country, but the fact cannot be concealed that in certified schools in this country boys are wilfully sent to college on certificate who have no right there. It may be said in defense that it is an error of judgment on the part of the principal or on the part of the teacher. Ladies and gentlemen, the line which separates a gross error of judgment from dishonesty is just as thin as the line which separates theft from kleptomania, and that, as it seems to me, has been one of the main reasons why the large universities of this country have stood out and said: "We will not accept a single certificate." Now, if we have a central board who will undertake to supervise the work of these schools and take the certificating out of the hands of individual masters or individual principals, that objection at least will be removed.

Now, what is the second? The second is, the colleges to-day have not the time or opportunity to investigate these schools. I agree with Doctor Sachs that there is just one fair way to the preparatory schools of this country to estimate their work, and that is by personal visits. I am ashamed to say, sir, and yet I

know it to be the truth, that there are masters in preparatory schools of this country who would be doing greater service to their country by digging the canal in Panama than in attempting to teach Latin or Greek or mathematics. I say I am ashamed to say so, and yet I am prompted to this as the truth. Now, it is not possible for the individual universities to send out men who should investigate these schools, but it does seem to me that a certificate board of this kind might be able to find the money and might be able to find the men with the time who could do that work successfully, and I am prompted to say, in justice to the schools, that that is the only solution of the difficulty. No gathering of information from the schools, no gathering of information from the colleges can take the place of personal visiting of examiners—whatever you may be pleased to call them—to schools, and so for those two reasons I urge strongly on this body that they shall lend their support to some central method of certificating.

MISS BERTHA BASS, WADLEIGH HIGH SCHOOL.—President Wilson said that there is no other way for judging of the fitness of an entering candidate for college than by the examination system. It reminded me of a bit of history which I think there is no impropriety in my telling in this presence.

A few years ago, when Alice Freeman Palmer, whom we all delight to honor, died suddenly in Paris, there was held in this city a memorial service—shall I say? it seemed like that; for two hours her friends and fellow-workers, those who knew her personally as student and as college president, talked about her. Miss Hazard, the president of Wellesley, was there and told us an intimate fact in regard to Alice Freeman Palmer that I have never forgotten. It seems that at the time the cable brought the news of Mrs. Palmer's sudden death, President Angell of Ann Arbor was spending a week at Wellesley, and in those first days of the sudden shock of the news he and Miss Hazard talked very frankly about Alice Freeman Palmer, and President Angell said that when she was admitted as a student to the University of Michigan they had a system—I don't know whether it still prevails—of assigning to some member of the faculty a certain number of the candidates for admission to the college, for personal interviews, as a check upon the results of the written

examination. President Angell was the one to interview Miss Freeman. She came from a small country high school and was not well prepared, through no fault of her own (some of us perhaps have known such boys and girls); and she did not pass the examination; and when the faculty sat in judgment upon the different sub-freshmen, and her name was mentioned, President Angell said: "I have talked with this girl; and if you will take her for six weeks on probation on my recommendation, if at the end of the six weeks you don't agree with me that she is fit to stay I will abide by your decision." At the end of the six weeks the faculty of Ann Arbor knew what that woman's work might be in scholarship; and—may I add one word?—through her influence in the University of Michigan a wave of religious life swept over that university and that State such as it had never known before, and for the first time the women students of Ann Arbor received proper treatment from the men. President Wilson said we are descended from Adam, but it seems to me he forgets that we are also descended from Eve.

PRINCIPAL WILLIAM W. BIRDSALL, PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS.—I wish to say two or three things. In the first place, I think the answer to President Wilson is not so much that the pupils who can pass entrance examinations are sometimes unable to do college work as that schools are really not responsible for the work of college students. Now the aspiring youth that comes up through our schools sometimes fails early in the school course and sometimes goes through the school with fair credit and climbs part way through the college and somewhere breaks down; but I don't think it is proper or fair to say that because a boy fails in the sophomore year in college he was not prepared to do freshman work, and it is preparation for freshman work which is the burden on us schoolmen. Secondly, I believe it is impossible for any method to be devised which will adequately or fairly sum up the work of the school; but, surely, the work of the school, so far as the college is concerned, is to prepare boys and girls for work in the freshman class, and for my part I am willing to be tried by the work of our girls in the freshman class in college, and I believe that other schools may well be; for certainly the percentage of pupils who, going into college fairly well prepared, go down in the first

semester, must be very small indeed. No doubt some of the girls who would present our recommendation to the colleges will not finally do the work; I should expect a certain percentage of failure to occur, but that error would necessarily be small. For my own part I am willing to abide by the work of our girls in the first semester of the freshman year. I want to ask Dr. Crawley whether his committee is prepared to make recommendations as to the method of appointment of the proposed board.

PRINCIPAL CHARLES D. LARKINS, BROOKLYN MANUAL TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL.—It is hardly worth while for me to come to the front for the little I have to say. Personally, I am opposed to a college entrance certificate board, or to admission to college on certificate in anyway. My reasons are two for my objection, and they seem to me to be valid. First, because I am obliged to sign the certificate, and I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, and I cannot tell what the boys will do in any school or any place after they leave our instruction. To illustrate, a few years ago a freshman who had maintained an excellent standing in our school had three or four hundred dollars—or something more; perhaps nearly a thousand dollars—fall to him, and he decided to go to college. He went into a boarding-house, and being more or less of a lively young man, he fell into company which resulted in dissipating his four or five hundred dollars, and he failed in college. His career in our school had been excellent; the surroundings amid which that young man spoiled himself were entirely responsible for his failure. If that young man had been certified, his failure would have been charged up to the school, which was in nowise responsible.

About five years ago a young man entered our school whose standing was excellent his first year. During the summer vacation he learned to smoke cigarettes. The following term his standing ran down; from that time on, as he succeeded in acquiring the tobacco habit, his standing continually dropped; he finished his course in school; his last term's work had not been at all to his credit. It was not a failure, but when we take into consideration what nature had done for him, his last year's work was not at all to his credit. Personally, I do not see how it would have been possible for us to certify as to what he would do in college. There was a continuous down-grade in his work;

if that down-grade continued he must necessarily fail in college; if, now, some influence surrounded him in college that should check that he would be successful. I do not see that we could certify that he would do satisfactory work.

Again, a young man some time ago entered the school, and during his first year was continually in trouble. He was reported to us frequently for not having done his work satisfactorily. His work during the first two years was more or less ragged. He went on, and the last year's work—particularly the last term's work—was fairly good, not especially good. I was very glad, indeed, when the time came for him to go to college, that I had announced four or five years ago that I would never again sign a recommendation or, rather, a certificate of admission to college. Here was a particular case that I did not feel that I could vouch for, and yet he passed his examinations, and I have heard within a week that he is likely to make the honor group in Amherst this present year—his first year in college. We cannot know definitely what young men will do, and it is not fair to the schools with which we are associated that they should be held responsible for pupils of that kind.

Again, one of the things we are asked to certify to on all of these certificates is that in our opinion the applicant has covered the work of the entrance requirements of the particular college to which he applies. I can certify that the boy either has or has not done his work satisfactorily in the school. I do not see how I can certify that he will be satisfactory to the college. So far as I am personally concerned, I decline to be held responsible by a college for any boy's preparation. It seems to me that the question as to whether a boy is fitted to enter Princeton, if you please, is not one for me to decide, not one for the school with which I am associated to decide, but a question entirely for Princeton to decide. If my boys are going to Cornell, Cornell should decide as to whether their preparation has been satisfactory or not, and so on; and it does not seem to me that it is fair to us as teachers or fair to our schools that we should be asked to certify to a boy's preparation for college; and I for one am frankly opposed to certification of any and all kinds.

Mr. Farrand.—I am not going to take any part in this discussion. I rise, in the absence of Professor Crawley, to answer

the question raised by Dr. Birdsall, as to how the committee propose that this college certificate board should be organized.

The committee felt that the organization of the board should be in the hands of those who were to conduct it, and the plan in view is this: If the report is accepted by the association at the business meeting to-morrow some one will move the appointment of a committee of this association to take the necessary steps for the organization of the board. That committee, in all probability, will, exactly as was done when the College Entrance Examination Board was formed, invite the co-operation of all the colleges in the association that are willing to go into the board—delegates from those colleges meeting together, probably asking the co-operation or the advice of certain representative schoolmasters—to frame a constitution for the board and to put it into operation. If that board decides, as the College Entrance Examination Board did, that it wishes secondary school representatives on the board, it will provide in its constitution for the appointment of its members—either have them appointed by this association or selected in some other way. That is the plan, as far as the committee had it in shape. Does that answer the question?

MR. BIRDSALL.—Quite satisfactorily.

PROF. HENRY BEDINGER MITCHELL, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—I wish only to ask a question, which I think probably Mr. Farrand will be able to answer, and that is, whether the committee has considered the feasibility of uniting the functions of this proposed board of certification with those now exercised by the examination board? It would seem as though the examination board already had a large part of the information and machinery the board of certification would need. It has a wide connection among the schools. It is at present conducting the examination of candidates sent to the colleges by those schools. It would seem, therefore, to be well qualified to judge of those conditions which would properly permit of the waiving of an examination and the acceptance of certificates from any particular school. I want to ask whether this plan has been considered, and, if so, what objections prevented its recommendation by the committee?

MR. FARRAND.—I am unable to state. My memory is at fault as to whether the committee formally considered that matter. The individual members of the committee did consider the matter in conference with representatives of the College Entrance Examination Board to see whether any feasible plan could be devised by which the college examination board could undertake this work; and all that I recall at the moment is that no plan that seemed feasible was suggested.

DR. BUCHANAN, DEWITT CLINTON HIGH SCHOOL.—It cannot be possible that the cause of failure of a boy in his first year in college is altogether the lack of preparation in the secondary school. Boys who have made first-class preparation in the secondary school tell me that often failure on the part of boys in their first year in college is traceable to one or more of several causes: (a) to too much freedom; (b) to too lax discipline; (c) to lack of enthusiasm on the part of the teacher in the college in the subject taught; (d) to the fact that teachers in colleges in first years are not as scholarly or as expert as are teachers in secondary schools; (e) to the emphasis given to athletics, in the hurras, bonfires and general excitement after each victory in college games.

THIRD SESSION

Friday, November 29th, at 8 P. M.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

SCHOOL AND COLLEGE.

PRESIDENT WOODROW WILSON, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

There is no one to introduce the speaker of the evening except myself. I would fain commend my friend to your indulgent hearing. He is essentially a modest man, but he is accustomed to utter certain ideas for the pleasure of intellectual adventure. There is no way in which to avoid life's falling dull unless you propose things which at least arouse discussion; and he professes to have found, in his brief experience as a college president, that no one is more serviceable to you than the men who oppose your ideas. My friend tells me that his ideas have been more perfected by those who have opposed them than by himself. They have enabled him to see the points at which they needed adjustment, the points at which they needed to be guarded, the points which would make them efficacious in execution. It is such a person, so disposed to learn, so new in learning in his present position, whom I have the pleasure of introducing to you this evening.

The topic I have chosen is one which allows me plenty of sea room. Speaking on "School and College," one can give himself leave to say almost anything about education that it pleases him to say; and I think that one of the greatest interests that attaches to our generation is, that almost everything regarding education has to be said over again.

We have just passed through a period in education when everything seemed in process of dissolution, when all standards were removed, when there was a universal dispersion of every established conception; when men did not hold themselves to plans, but opened the whole field, as if you drew a river out of its courses and invited it to spread abroad over the countryside. For there was a time in the generation which preceded our own, when education was confined within very narrow courses, when it did

not sufficiently fertilize the great areas of educational interest—of intellectual interests; and it was the task of that particular generation to see that the waters were no longer confined to a little territory, but were allowed to spread abroad over a great new land.

To come out of my figure, we have just passed through a period when the whole domain of knowledge has been added to by subject after subject, and when it was absolutely necessary that the boundaries should be constantly enlarged in order that we might include the new things that had come to engage the human mind.

It does not make very much difference how you define the features of the period through which we have passed. The term under which we generally designate it is "the elective system of studies." I received a catalogue from a college the other day, a college not ancient in its foundation, in which it was stated that the institution was ready to offer 365 courses, and would offer any others upon the demand of as many as five students. In other words, this institution, like its elders and betters, had undertaken to put upon its curriculum almost every known subject of study, and had put all those subjects of study upon its curriculum upon an equal footing, not presuming to suggest to the student which were the greater subjects and which the minor; not presuming to point out to him what was the natural point of entrance and the natural point of exit, but inviting him to enter anywhere and go any whither in his search for knowledge throughout a vast and various field.

This is what I have called the period of dispersion, the period of the dissolution of standards, when we do not undertake to say that one study is more worth while than another study, but say to every student: "Judge for yourself, by your own tastes to begin with, which studies are most worth while for you; and sit you down to a free feast!"

Not only so, but we have just passed through a period abounding in pedagogical theories. We have been doing nothing else than make reckless experiments upon lads and youths, upon girls and maidens, for the purpose of testing newfangled notions which we put forth out of intellectual curiosity more than out of deep conviction. I was talking not long ago to a very interesting lady, who was trying to expound to me some of the new

theories of education, finding me to be a very ignorant person; and she was talking to me about the individual child, and the sociologic child, and various other kinds of children until I became confused; and I said, "I beg your pardon, but I am afraid I don't know what you are talking about"; and she said, "Perhaps it is the terms I am using." "No," I replied; "I am afraid it is the ideas you are using." She was representing each child as having a sort of section here and there in its intellectual biology which made it necessary to treat one section of the child after one chemistry of development and another layer of the child after another chemistry of development. I had never met children so sectionalized; I had never been aware that I had myself developed out of such an incomplete and un-united series of sections; and so I was confused not by her terminology (for I understood what the words meant), but by her ideas, for I was unable to grasp them.

And yet she was perfectly serious; she was very capable; and she was subjecting the children whom she dealt with to experimentation upon the basis of these theories. You know perfectly well what the result has been; you know that the children of the past two or three decades in our schools have not been educated. You know that the pupils in the colleges in the last several decades have not been educated. You know that with all our teaching we train nobody; you know that with all our instructing we educate nobody. I say you know this—not meaning that you will admit it in a public discussion, but that when you are alone upon your knees at night you would feel obliged to confess it.

I have had the experience (which I am sure is common to modern teachers) of feeling that I was bending all my efforts to do a thing which was not susceptible of being done, and that the teaching that I professed to do was as if done in a vacuum, as if done without a transmitting medium, as if done without an atmosphere in which the forces could be transmitted. I am not indicting other persons any more than I am indicting myself. I have been teaching now for nearly twenty years; I have been conducting classroom exercises for nearly twenty years; and I don't think I have been teaching any appreciable portion of that time. I have been delivering lectures which I meant to be interesting; I have been saying things some of which I knew; I have been repeating other things—many other things—which I

have heard; I have been putting together views of knowledge much more systematic than my own investigations warranted me in putting together; and the result has been that my pupils have for the most part remembered my stories and forgotten my lectures. Because it is one of the privileges of a teacher, I think, to be bored, himself, with his own lecture and to allow himself to depart once and again from the course of the lecture in order to tell a story which has more or less connection with what he is saying.

I wish to state these things, if need be, in an extravagant form, in order to have you realize that we are upon the eve of a period of reconstruction. We are upon the eve of a period when we are going to set up standards. We are upon the eve of a period of synthesis, when, tired of this dispersion and standardless analysis, we are going to put things together into something like a connected and thought-out scheme of endeavor. It is inevitable; I never attend any gathering of this kind that I do not hear the frankest admissions that we are in search of the fundamental principles of the thing that we are trying to do.

It is certainly a most favorable state of mind in which to enter a new age. No man who knows the history of knowledge would think of impeaching the men who have been responsible for the dissolution of standards, because until the old narrow curricula were shattered it was impossible to include in our conception of learning all those great new bodies of knowledge which have arisen almost within the lifetime of men now living. It is only since about 1850 that the great bodies of science which we now teach have come into existence in teachable form; and it is only within that time that science has won its place among the great disciplines of the human mind; it is only within that period that we have taken the physical universe within the boundaries of our comprehension and have tried to make men acquainted, not merely with the things which proceed out of their own consciousness, but also with the things which proceed out of their own environment. It was necessary that the old hard-and-fast bodies of study should be broken in upon like antiquated fortresses, a new garrison put in, and all knowledge given leave at any rate to be brought into the syntheis which we were subsequently to attempt.

You will notice that whenever we have a serious discussion,

such as the discussions which have characterized the sessions of this Association to-day, we find ourselves confused, because we are talking about several different things at the same time, and are sometimes misled into supposing that we are talking about one and the same thing. We are not often enough aware that in speaking of education—present-day education—we are really speaking of two things and not of one thing. We must discriminate the two things of which the modern age stands in need. It stands in need, in the first place, of technical training: the great majority of our young people must be made mechanics. I do not mean *merely* mechanics of the hand, but mechanics *also* of the mind. They must be given some skilled capacity to accomplish certain definite and narrow tasks—must be given technical training—all those things which lead up to skill in particular material occupations and which are more necessary in our age than they ever were in any preceding age. There is almost no limit to the number of expert intellectual or manual mechanics which this age needs. The number of technical things there are to be understood, the number of technical things there are to be done, the number of technical things there are to be combined is almost beyond calculation. The majority of our youth must be given an exact and thorough technical training. That is one of the things this age needs; and if you count heads, it is the main thing that this age needs.

But in education we don't count heads: that is to say, we don't count the outsides of them. There is another sort of education which this age needs, and needs more than any preceding age: that kind which for many ages has borne amongst us the name of liberal education. If ever an age stood in need of men capable of seeing the invisible things, it is the age in which we live. If ever an age stood in need of the statesmanship of mind, this is that age; if ever an age stood in need of men lifted a little above their fellows in their point of view, who can see the significance of knowledge and of affairs, this is the age. If our great army of workers is to be left to work with their gaze concentrated upon the task, and there is no one to see visions, no one to order the field, no one to organize the great functions of mind and of organized effort of which we stand in need every day—why, then, we shall stumble upon immediate disaster. We are in need as no age ever was of liberal education; there are so

many things to co-ordinate in our thinking that we sadly stand in need of thinkers. When I speak of education, therefore, I mean a liberal education as distinguished from technical training, for it is to that theme I wish to confine myself this evening.

I am speaking of something which we too often leave out of our reckoning when we are thinking of our schools and colleges. I don't need to tell this company that information is not education; and I need only point out to you that in the great bulk of the work that we do in our schools and colleges, we are seeking nothing more than to impart information. We are seeking to communicate bodies of fact. Now, bodies of fact do not educate. Information is not an education. Information may clog the powers of the mind instead of drawing them forth. Information, unless the mind has the scope and grasp to digest and order it, is merely an impediment to the action of the mind. My father was in the habit of using very explicit English; and one of the things I remember him saying to me in one of the very early stages of my own education was this: "My son," he said, "the mind is not a prolix gut to be stuffed."

Now, when you think of the prolixity of the gut which is stretched back from the day of college graduation to the day of entering upon the primary school and think of the systematic stuffing it has undergone ever since the process was begun, you don't need to be told that there has been no process of digestion whatever. The figure is coarse only because we regard one of the words in it as coarse. It is true—as true as any material figure can be to a spiritual fact. It behooves us, therefore, to see what we are going to choose as our ideal standards in education. I mean, what we are going to understand education to be, let me again say, as distinguished from technical training, which I am not disparaging, but which I am now seeking to discriminate from this other thing.

It seems to me that the idea of education involves three things: it involves in the first place enlightenment. I read a very whimsical essay the other day by that delightful newer essayist of ours, Mr. Crothers, entitled "The Anglo-Saxon School of Polite Unlearning." Mr. Crothers pretends to have discovered in an out-of-the-way part of London a school whose object is to dispossess persons of their erroneous prepossessions, acting upon the principle that the trouble with us is the number of things that

we know that we are not so; and one of the most interesting pupils represented to be in this school was an Oxford graduate, who was contemplating an early visit to the United States. They had there undertaken to unload him of his misinformation about the United States of America. One of the exercises they gave him was this: they gave him an extract from a San Francisco newspaper saying that O'Brien, the well-known pugilist, was now devoting himself to literary studies and, under the guidance of a tutor, was reading Homer, Dante, and Milton, expecting, after he retired from the ring, to devote himself to literary pursuits. The Oxford man was directed to write an essay upon this extract showing how characteristic it was of a crude country to suppose that anybody was ready to study anything; "and then," said his teacher, "after satisfying yourself by proving that you with your classical education are much better able to appreciate Homer than O'Brien is, ask yourself which Homer would have appreciated more—you or O'Brien." It is so obvious that Homer would have preferred O'Brien! A stroke of insight and wit like that seems to strip away all the false paraphernalia with which we have surrounded classical learning and to set the Iliad up before us as an epic of the natural human being.

A great deal of perception is to be got by thus unloading most of the unilluminated information which we have conveyed to our pupils, by stripping away ruthlessly all those adornments of careful, painstaking scholarship which have obscured the storied facts of human existence; and one flash of the perception that Homer would have loved O'Brien is more illuminating than all the Oxford training with regard to the classics in that particular specimen of the Oxford outlook. It at least renders Homer as he probably was. That is what I call enlightenment; it is letting in that very rare thing in college and school classrooms—illuminating perception of what the thing means.

We are so punctilious about form in our teaching; we are so careful not to use gross words like the word gut; we are so careful to avoid the real facts of the case; we are so careful to obscure knowledge by interposing between the pupil and knowledge that great, thick, impenetrable body that we call information, the enormous, incalculable mass of irrelevant facts: facts irrelevant to the spiritual intent of the thing itself! It is a great

deal better to see one thing than merely to look at a thousand; it is a great deal better to penetrate to the heart of some one mystery than to idly speculate about a score of mysteries. And so it is better to conduct the student to the interior *penetralia* of some great subject than to take him on an excursion "Seeing Greater Knowledge."

Then there is another object in education; and that is what we have latterly grown into the habit of calling orientation—a word carrying certainly a very beautiful figurative meaning—that is to say, showing, with regard to some one thing perceived, how it stands related to the other things which the mind is capable of perceiving. There was a very interesting suggestion made in one of the discussions this forenoon when it was shown that our universities in their attempt to train teachers did not train the kind of teachers that would be most serviceable in the secondary schools because they did not train teachers who saw the relations of the particular things they taught to the larger bodies of knowledge to which they belonged. One of the speakers suggested that every university should have some one whose object it should be by some stimulating form of lecture to bring the students of pedagogical method to perceive that in handling any one subject they were moving in a particular part of the great domain of knowledge. It has always been a favorite idea of mine that every university should have a professor of things in general—that every university should have some one who would take the entering class and show them, as if upon a map, the great extending fields of knowledge: "Here lies biology, but close neighbor to it, so that you can hardly draw the frontiers, lies chemistry; and there close to chemistry (with boundaries again obscured) lies physics; and there alongside physics (again without scientific frontier) lies mathematics; and there, surrounding all this territory of related subjects, lie the great and sometimes shadowy territories of philosophy, our conception of what the human mind is capable of, of what the brain perceives, what the mind comprehends and what it is possible to establish by reason, the demonstrable, the undemonstrable, the purely speculative, the knowable. You are ever upon a continent of knowledge; you cannot look far abroad without seeing into other great territories of study. And all this territory has had an ancient and honorable history; up and down these great plains and upon

these great slopes have moved the great armies of human thinkers."

In the old ages, when they knew little of the history of thought, they went about among shadows, went about subject to many strange superstitions, which overcame them when they went out upon their expeditions to learn; but by slow degrees the mind's conquests of arms were pushed forward; men went first into this *terra incognita,* and there lies before us the map of the known world of knowledge.

It seems to me that it would be possible for the youngster to find himself in any one subject by knowing how it stands related to its great neighbor subjects, and never after that feel that he was in contact with a mere body of information, but know that he was in the territory of a great kingdom where vital forces were afield and where any day some new flash of light might come to make the way plainer and the day broader.

And so this business of orientation, of showing the youngster where he is, is one of the chief businesses of education. It is not necessary for the teacher alone; it is necessary also for the pupil, that he should know where he is. I cannot refrain from returning to a favorite illustration of mine (which I am sure some of my friends present have heard). When a man loses his way in a strange country you say that he has lost himself, and yet, in fact, that is the only thing he has *not* lost: *he* is *there.* That is demonstrable, and he knows it. But *he has lost all the rest of the world.* If he knew where any fixed point was, he could steer by it; but he doesn't know any fixed point, and therefore he has lost all the rest of the world.

Now, if you take a human mind and put it in a strange country and leave it, it is there, but it hasn't the least notion where it is; it is lost in the strictest sense of the word. That is, so far as its consciousness is concerned; it is nowhere at all. It has no relations to anything else. And you get the figure of orientation by knowing that if you only give that mind the notion of where the East is, it is easy after that to find the West and the North and the South and to box the whole compass; but not until some point of the compass is known.

But there is another object of education. We have talked a great deal in our day about enlightenment and about orientation; but we have stopped talking about *discipline.* The chief object

of education is discipline. There is an old and trite illustration which must always be used, because it is the best illustration; that is, the illustration of the gymnasium. I have never heard of any youngster who went into the gymnasium because he expected to do the double trapeze with his partner in business when he graduated. I have never seen anything done in the gymnasium which was practical, in the sense in which we are now inclined to use that word with regard to the subject of education. All that the youngster in the gymnasium is trying to do is to get his muscles in such shape and the red corpuscles of his blood in such heart that he can do anything with himself physically that he wishes afterward; can stand the strains and be ready for all the sudden exertions of life; so that his heart will be used to having a strain put upon it and can pump, with slow and persistent complacency, when the utmost strains of life are put upon it at last.

That is discipline of the body; and anything that can discipline the body is serviceable for the uses of our physical life. Similarly, anything—it is sometimes a matter of indifference what—that can discipline the mind is serviceable for our life intellectual; and what does not discipline the mind is not serviceable.

If you accept that principle, then you cannot put all subjects of study upon an equality. Some things discipline the mind, and some do not. Some things are difficult and some things easy; and nothing so disciplines the mind as that which is difficult. I think the ideal method of discipline intellectually would be to give young people the things hardest for them to do, and then as soon as they begun to be easy, stop them and give them something else that was hard, so that they might presently get accustomed to the constant strain of fibre which would make anything after that easy of accomplishment. There is an old adage: "Beware of the man of one book!" By which is not meant beware of him because he is narrow, but beware of him because he knows something, and if you get in his track with regard to that thing you are going to get run over. If every man was a man of one book, of one subject, your only right strategy in life would be to feel tenderly around when you got in conversation with him until you found what his one subject of conversation was, and then avoid that. The athleticism of perfection in that one thing would make him a dangerous and ugly customer to handle.

When you come to look over the exceedingly various fields of modern knowledge, how many elements are there? Not how many subjects—they are innumerable—but how many *elements?* I do not see more than these: science (by which I mean pure science), literature, philosophy, history. Of course, in speaking of literature I include language, which is the vehicle of literature; of course, in speaking of history, I include politics, which concerns itself with many of the chief transactions of history; but, if we make the proper inclusions of these terms, what else is there besides pure science, pure philosophy, pure literature, and history and politics?

There are four bodies of discipline. There is the body of discipline which we call science; and inasmuch as almost all sciences have the same method and involve the same processes of observation and generalization, they can be regarded as alike in disciplinary effect. Not all of them are alike in the degree in which they discipline; but all of them are alike in the kind of discipline to which they subject the human mind.

Then there is the great body of philosophical thinking: by which I do not mean vague speculation as to the human mind, but the rational putting together of the experiences of the human mind.

And then there is pure literature, that product of thought and of fancy and of form which springs almost (it would sometimes seem in the case of great national literatures) out of the common consciousness, where the most exquisite voices are, the voices which most perfectly express the general and common impulse, where your most authentic spokesman is the poet, who can demonstrate nothing, but who feels and perceives everything. And for the hearing of this authentic voice you must be master of its instrument, of the speech which it uses.

Then there are all the transactions of the human race which we call its history and politics.

Now, in seeking a process of enlightenment, of discipline, and of orientation amidst these great bodies of knowledge, *how* are we going to seek them? It seems to me, ladies and gentlemen, that we shall never accomplish anything in our attempt at educational reorganization until we get rid of the idea which too much pervades an association, like this—the idea that our relations to each other as schoolmen and collegemen is that the one set of us

are preparing youngsters for the other set of us to teach. Until we realize that the school and the college are doing the same thing exactly, we shall not get anywhere. Until we realize that, it is neither here nor there with regard to the kind of thing we are doing whether the boy or girl is going beyond the school course or going to stop at the end of it. It is only a question of how far you carry them in a process which is the same from beginning to end; and if there were any process, such as the process of certification that we were discussing this afternoon, which could make us unaware that we were crossing a bridge when we were leaving the school and entering the college; if there were some common method of life for the schoolboy and the collegeman which should make him feel less sharply than he does that when he leaves the school and enters the college he has entered a new kind of world, it would be worth while to make all the changes necessary in order to adopt it—in order to make the boy feel that he is not going from one thing to another, but that he is simply going on to prosecute a little further the fair journey upon which he had set out.

We ought to realize that the school is not preparing the boy for the college, but that school and college are alike endeavoring, so far as time and opportunity permit, to educate the boy; and therefore it is just as important for the school to make up its mind what its method of enlightening, of discipline and of orientation is to be, as for the college.

We are all of one family; we are all engaged upon the same thing; and we cannot do it in two ways. We must do it in one way. If we do it in two ways we shall miss connection. Therefore, it seems to me that you must set your technical training schools apart from your other schools; your technical colleges apart from your other colleges. I do not mean geographically apart from them. I think they ought to have a spiritual relationship, which is best preserved when they are in close geographical juxtaposition; but I mean that you must not confuse the aims and processes of the one with the aims and processes of the other, must not try to do two things at once with the same pupils. I am asking you to consider liberal education to-night as a task of the school as well as a task of the college.

Now, if I have been speaking the truth, what is the proper method of liberal education? I have spoken of its object, name-

ly, enlightenment, discipline, orientation; I have spoken of its elements: pure science, pure philosophy, pure literature, history and politics. Now, what of its method? Well, in the first place, it seems to me that you must choose a particular body of studies; you must choose a particular sequence of studies; you must choose a particular systematization and relation of studies; not the same for all men, for all pupils, but some one consistent thing for each pupil. Let me illustrate. I am not going to make practical suggestions. The suggestions I am going to make are merely by way of illustration and are unpractical, because for the moment impracticable. I am simply trying to point you forward to a time which may come, but which I do not know whether we shall ever see.

Suppose that you were to make up your mind to find your liberal education in the schools in this way: to give every pupil the fundamental science; that is to say, mathematics; to give every pupil one language—let him choose any one he pleases besides Latin. It happens that Latin is the medium, so to say the background—almost the substance—of so many modern languages that it is in a sense indispensable. Let him choose one language besides the Latin—let it be Greek or let it be Spanish; it does not make any difference whether it is a modern language or an ancient language, but one language besides Latin —let him swim from first to last in the atmosphere of Latin, and then let him choose one language besides Latin. Then give up the attempt to teach English literature. You can teach English literature as a science, which it is not; or as an art, which in your hands it cannot be; but whichever way you choose to attempt to teach it you will fail, if you regard it as a thing to be objectively imparted. You cannot pedagogically impart the song of a bird; you cannot pedagogically impart the appreciation of a landscape; you cannot pedagogically impart even the nice appreciation of idioms. The only way you will ever appreciate the idiom is by hearing it often; the idiom you hear most of you will most appreciate. I judge that the modern young college man and the modern young college woman most appreciate the idiom we call slang, for I don't hear them use anything else with gusto. The other idioms which they use they use as if they were on dress parade and knew that they were talking to a college professor. For them the only possible appreciation is the appreciation of

slang, which in certain instances I very much appreciate myself. I admit that there are exigencies in one's life when nothing else will serve.

English, I believe, will some day come to have its proper place, both in our schools and in our colleges. It will be, what it is not to-day—the medium of all instruction. If you hold yourselves to the rule that nothing is taught by you correctly that is not taught in the best English you can command, and if you accustom the pupil to realize the fact that nothing is acceptable from him or her by way of reply that is not couched in the best English within their reach, you won't have to teach English as a language in any other way. The only way to learn English and to appreciate it is to use it. That is the law with regard to every fact. The only way to feel its power, the only way to find its thrill communicable to you, is to get into electric connection with it by appropriating its power and making it think your thoughts, making it the vehicle of your messages from mind to mind.

I have sometimes wondered what would happen to a college class if every examination paper were rejected which did not contain correct English. There wouldn't be any school certified then, because everybody would fail. And the excuse is, that they had to be so rapidly written; in other words, we know so little English that we need time and deliberation to use it. That is because from our childhood up we have not been brought to book and made to use it. We have been told stories in the crudest form, instead of being carried to the exquisite fountains of English in which all our older stories are to be found—instead of having been reared, from the time we were born until now, upon the sweet musical sound of a language richer than any other in cadence and sweetness, we have been given the rough phrases of the street ever since we can remember; and we cannot be taught English literature on those terms. If you ever teach English in your schools or colleges it will be because English is the atmosphere in your schools and colleges, the vehicle of their thoughts.

And then it is perfectly possible in every school to give the pupils a sense of the movement of affairs in the world in the past and at the present time. I think the impression I got when I was a boy of history was that it was something that had happened long ago, but wasn't happening now. I certainly got the

impression that almost every schoolboy gets, that Cæsar's Commentaries were written for a schoolbook. If I had ever been allowed to realize the fact that this book was written by a famous general of what he did himself I think I would have sat up nights and taken notice; but none of these things were communicated to me. I was simply asked: "In what case is that noun?"

You will say that this is reducing education to very simple terms. Yes, very simple terms. But suppose you had a thorough grasp on the fundamental principles of mathematics; suppose that you thoroughly knew Latin and were thoroughly grounded in some one other language; suppose that you could really read the English language and love its finer forms; suppose that you had a conception of the reality of history—don't you think you will be fairly educated? And how many of your pupils has any one of those things? I am not blaming you; you have been caught in a ridiculous system, where we are trying to teach a student everything and don't teach him anything. When we come down to the real education of school children and undergraduates, we are going to come down to some basis like this.

When you pass over into the college, what are you going to do? You are going to make the pupil take one science besides his mathematics, in which he is already grounded and which he will need in almost any science that he takes. Mathematics is, so to say, science relieved of the embarrassments of physical environment. It is science which is free of the trammels of time and space, and reasons about everything with its feet off the ground for the most part, so that it may reason without impediment, but which reasons with the strictest fidelity from the premises to the conclusion, and will not allow itself to leap in the process or diverge from the direct line of inference. So that it is the fundamental discipline of all scientific thinking. If your youngster really has got his mind habituated to that kind of fidelity in the treatment of his premises, then put him in some one science and give him four years of it. Let him continue the one language besides Latin whose grammar and vocabulary you grounded him in in school, and let him take that four years so that when he comes out he can read anything in that language and can speak it and write it with ease. Subject him during those four years also to the principal processes of philosophical training: logic, the main conceptions of psychology, the main items of the

history of human thought, the conceptions men have had of the universe and of their relation to it, and of their own processes of thinking; and you will incidentally have done everything that I have been suggesting with regard to the school. You will have saturated him in two literatures: in the literature of the language which he is adding to Latin and in the literature of his own language, because it will be a constant medium for everything that he thinks.

And then, at last, because in the school he has learned the reality of history and of political action, you can take him out upon the great field of the systematic study of history for four years.

Four subjects pursued for four years will have a remarkable effect upon him when he graduates. Where are we now amidst a miscellany of studies? It is said that the quantity of our entrance examinations is too great; of course it is too great; but it is not too great simply because we add a little piece here to mathematics and another over there in Latin and piece out the subjects; but because we have an enormous variety of subjects which every school is obliged to prepare its pupils in if they are going to enter college. There will be, after we have made our changes, as many subjects for the school, but not as many subjects for any one student. He will be examined (if I may recur to my illustration again) in his mathematics, in his Latin, in the one language which he has qualified to follow, and in practically nothing else; and when he comes out, he will have had enlightenment and discipline and orientation. I sympathized so deeply with Dr. Sihler this morning when he said that we shall be obliged to reduce our education for each person—not for all, but for each person,—to a small body of great subjects; and until we have done that, we will not have returned to the true process of education.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you will say: "You have attempted to deliver to us a very dogmatic and far-reaching lecture on education; and you have called it 'School and College'." What else could I call it? For the central idea I wish to leave with you is, that in purpose and method there is no difference between school and college. We have neglected the union and organization of forces. We have divided our learning as if we had done away with our union of States and had dissolved the federal

government into a body of local principalities; and so we have neglected the very genius of our race, which is the genius of organization. The only way in which the American people have not yet shown a supreme genius in organization is that they have not yet shown a genius for simplification.

The very genius of organization is simplification. That man has not a genius for executive duty or for organization who multiplies means of action. He is the true genius who unites and simplifies; and so our real task for the immediate future is to discover the essential elements of education, whether they be those that are found catalogued here or not, and then with the utmost courage and with profound simplicity bring them together into a great *organum* which we shall be able after that to use as the lasting standard of the things we are trying to do.

We have enlarged our territories of knowledge, and we are at the same stage of mind that the Supreme Court is in: it says that Porto Rico is foreign territory and the Philippines are not: I have forgotten whether it is that way or the other way; it doesn't make any difference; but for some purposes they are foreign countries and for other purposes they are domestic countries, and we have not found the method of law by which to tie them unto ourselves and digest them into our political system. So with our knowledge: we have annexed territories and not known how to govern and unite them to those that are older and more established in their forms of instruction. What I plead for is, not agreement with the specific things that I have made this discourse up of, but agreement with the great thesis that I have endeavored, by all sorts of excursions and illustrations, to illustrate, namely: that we have missed the meaning of education; we have forgotten to assemble the elements of education; and we have forgotten to concentrate and simplify its methods.

FOURTH SESSION

Saturday, November 30th, at 10 A. M.

PREPARATION FOR COLLEGE AS A MEANS OF EDUCATION.

DR. THOMAS STOCKHAM BAKER, TOME INSTITUTE.

The schoolboy of to-day does not do enough work. His school-year is not long enough and the vacations are too frequent and too protracted. He is the creature of so many distractions that the real object of going to school is frequently forgotten. We find our boys getting more and more restless from year to year. We find an increasing craving for excitement, for diversions, a growing interest in the amusements of older people. The violent upheaval that follows an athletic victory, the obtrusive business of running the manifold schoolboy enterprises—his year book, his newspaper, his fraternities, his dramatic societies, his so-called musical organizations—these are but a few of the subjects which occupy his attention and drag him away from his scholastic work. There is always something to disconcert the normal course of his studies.

This is accompanied by a noticeable aging of the boys. I venture to say that the boy of seventeen is a far more sophisticated person than would have been possible twenty-five years ago. His interests, his pastimes, his very vocabulary are those of a senior in college of former days. The boys of to-day are too old. They have lost much of the charm of boyishness in their efforts to ape the manners and mannerisms of their elders. Their lives are becoming too complex, their engagements too varied, their amusements too high pitched, and the efforts which the humble schoolmaster makes to arouse an interest in learning for its own sake and to awaken an enthusiasm for literature, are very tasteless offerings to counterbalance the violent fascination of the lad's highly spiced diversions.

It is the duty of the schoolmaster to use every possible means to simplify the existence of schoolboys; to set his face against the present extravagances—extravagance in the waste of time,

extravagance in the neglect of opportunities. Public sentiment should stamp such excesses as vulgar and unworthy of institutions whose object is the care of boys in the most impressionable period of their lives. The artificialities of existence come soon enough, and no effort should be spared to keep at least the schools free from them.

Furthermore, the prevalent idea that the school is merely a temporary abiding place, that the college is the real aim and object of the years of servitude which are passed in preparation, adds another element to the unrest and unsettlement of spirit which pervade secondary schools. Whip and spur are applied to drive the boy into college. He must reach this goal no matter at what cost. The work of the school is of consequence in so far as it increases the speed of the onrush.

The schools are getting very bad nerves. Between the violent amusements and the breakneck educational policy to which we are committed there is very little opportunity for repose, without which no serious work of any kind can be done. Let us stop, let us pray for a quieter spirit in our schools, let us have our pupils boys again, and then we can talk reasonably about the relation of the colleges and the schools.

Preparation for college is an entirely satisfactory means of education if it teaches principles as well as the mere facts; if the emphasis is placed upon quality rather than quantity. The school is the place where the man is to get his habits of work, his mental self-control, his appreciation of the value of time and finally a respect for learning and letters. We cannot expect the colleges to make thinkers and artists out of our pupils if we do not teach them how to take advantage of the opportunities which are given them.

After all, the chief object of education should be to train the will quite as much as the mind. A man who can control his will can usually direct his mind in the most profitable way. Therefore, in dealing with boys, it should be our first duty to aid them to become masters of themselves, and to wisely administer their abilities, their powers and their time. Boys who are permitted to dissipate their energies in the distractions with which we are very familiar cannot hope to acquire this mental poise which is inestimable. It can only be gained by practicing a very careful system in the arrangement of the day's work. Study hours

should be kept inviolable as the most sacred part of the school's engagements. There should be an absolutely rigid routine. Furthermore, the quality of work done in these periods of preparation should be controlled in some manner. Boys frequently pass long periods over their books without getting any tangible results. It is the power of mental concentration which is to be sought for, and every device that the schoolmaster can find should be employed to further this end. Here the boarding school has certain advantages over a day school, although I would not maintain that it has not also disadvantages. In a properly conducted boarding school it is possible to control the study hours more completely than in a day school. Boys who live at home conform to the routine of their household. Parents rarely have time to supervise their work. On this account their preparation may be less certain.

We can only teach proper principles by exacting serious work and a great deal of it. I conceive the greatest benefit that a school can bestow upon a boy is, not to place him in college with a good grade, but to teach him how to study, and the average boy only learns this after years of persistent effort to keep him at his tasks.

We hear a great deal nowadays about the manly boy and about the dangers of his becoming a mollycoddle, but in our efforts to make his school life attractive we are in danger of developing a race whose later course will be far more disastrous than if it had enjoyed in its youth a vigorous course of plain living and high thinking. And the eternal college entrance question places in one's way a tremendous temptation to help the boy over the rough places instead of placing the responsibility on him. We coach him, we annotate his texts down to the minutest details, we simplify his tasks, we remove all the inequalities from the high-road of learning, and we are in danger of producing a *mental mollycoddle*—a type whose intellectual powers are distressingly sickly and stunted. He may be a hero in all that pertains to physical strenuosity, but his mind is strangely sluggish. The mental mollycoddle is not an unusual product of this our forcing process.

The incessant coaching methods which we have to pursue give to much of the teaching done by the secondary school a utilitarian character which is to be deplored. We are compelled to teach

in the way which will best satisfy the college entrance requirements, and while the keynote of all correct education should be "Learning for its own sake," we have to countenance a good deal the motto, "Learn in order to get into college." This is crass utilitarianism, which has no place in a system in which correct ideals are of paramount importance.

But how can we change the point of view which schools have to maintain? This, ladies and gentlemen, must be a matter of time. First, we must ask the colleges to adopt a qualitative analysis of our work instead of the quantitative method now generally in vogue. Second, we must ask the colleges to do away with certain of their irrational conditions. In another place I have spoken of the vagaries of college entrance requirements. These are familiar to most teachers, and I am sure some of the most glaring inconsistencies will be corrected in the near future. In the meantime the schools must send boys to college, and we must accept the conditions as they exist. To conform to these conditions, and at the same time to teach right principles, we must insist upon more careful primary preparation and upon a greater degree of industry on the part of our pupils. We shall be compelled to refuse to accept boys in the secondary schools who are deficient in elementary training, and we shall have to refuse to accept the responsibility for idlers.

There are many beautiful phrases such as "character building," "moral atmosphere," "uplifting the boy," which are used very glibly and which are very suggestive, but the school that has the best atmosphere is generally the school where the most work is done. The boy improves most quickly mentally, morally and physically who is kept the busiest.

No, we do not want a nation of prigs nor of bookworms nor of professors (Heaven forbid!), but we can make use of more scholars and more real students. We can dispense with quite a little nervous energy if we can have more right-thinking. Universities and scientific foundations cannot bring this about unless our schools teach a real appreciation of accurate scholarship. A clever Harvard professor has said that we do not want the "sweat-shop" educational policy of Germany. Doubtless, German methods would be entirely unwarranted in this country and in this climate. But we cannot but admire the results that are achieved in the Fatherland, and ought at least to hope that we may get some of the German spirit without its asperities.

To be sure, every practical schoolmaster knows the difficulty of getting even the most elementary conceptions into the heads of some boys. He believes he has achieved an educational triumph if he succeeds in putting one of these helpless lads into the least exacting of colleges. He feels that he has no time to think of such vague abstractions as scholarly atmosphere, but he will welcome the most trifling assistance in getting rid of some of the distractions which disturb his dull pupils.

On the other hand, a boy's mind must be active. It is as natural for him to develop mentally as it is for him to grow physically. The task of the schoolmaster is to utilize this inexhaustible mental energy which is lodged in the growing boy. It is indeed very elusive, and its natural course seems to be rather away from books and in the direction of all sorts of extravagant diversions. The amount of ingenuity and mental power that a boy expends in learning the batting averages of the leading baseball players or the peculiarities of the college football teams is sufficient, if utilized in more scholastic directions, to accomplish great results.

Every teacher has been more than once surprised at the extraordinary knowledge which boys display of all sorts of seemingly useless things. But when we try to interest them in mathematical problems or grammatical questions their minds seem to become blank. It frequently happens that boys who are apparently very alert and intelligent show the most excessive stupidity in the classroom. Wonderful transformations, however, take place sometimes, and we can all recall such instances. The boy happens to become interested in some chance topic; it may not be a strict school subject, but he is aroused; he wins a prize for a declamation or composition, or it may be for manual training or drawing—and he is a changed boy. His interest extends to other subjects, and only a spark was needed to arouse the slumbering mental energy. Such cases are more frequent in proportion as the atmosphere of the school is stimulating. Where the emphasis is laid upon good scholarship, boys are more quickly aroused to exert themselves, and the proportion of hopeless students is lessened.

It would seem that the college requirements as they exist today present us with a fair proportion of the ingredients which should make for the education of a well-rounded man. The

adjustment of the amount of the classics, mathematics, modern languages and science seems to be very nearly a correct one. On this account we of the secondary schools owe a debt to the colleges for their recommendations. There was a time when the schools were far less able to make up a proper curriculum than is at present the case. The suggestions which came from the higher institutions were then of the most vital consequence in shaping the course of educational development. But as the schools have grown in size and number, the colleges have been relieved of much of the work that they formerly had to do. The preponderating influence of the colleges has also been lessened. The advice and the experience of schoolmen have been accepted with increasing appreciation, and there is every reason to believe that the mutual understanding between the two classes of institutions is becoming from day to day more satisfactory.

In this connection I am impelled to refer to what seems to me to be a defect in one of the requirements which the technical institutions make for admission. There are very few engineering schools which lay any emphasis upon the study of Latin as an entrance requirement. It is quite natural that this should be the case. The classics do not play any important part in the equipment of a technical expert. But a failure to hold boys up to the requirements in Latin for admission to these special courses unconsciously lowers the standard of admission. Boys frequently do not decide to go to college until quite late in their school course. A boy of seventeen or eighteen makes up his mind at the eleventh hour that he wants to have collegiate training. He looks up the matter of the admission requirements. He casts up his own account and finds out in what subjects he is deficient. Yes, he has studied Latin, it may be for a year or two, but he has had no great success. He finds that he would have to put two or three more years on this subject, and he is unwilling to wait. He wants to go to college, and it does not make a great deal of difference to him where he goes, just so he finds an institution that does not prescribe Latin. So the engineering school is the nearest thing to hand, and in order to get within the academic walls he makes up his mind all at once to become an engineer, although he may have no serious convictions about the profession of engineering. The chief determining factor has been to get to a place where his poor work in Latin will not count against him. The effect upon

the standard of the higher institution is very obvious. This is not intended as a plea for the study of Latin. It is merely an observation which is frequently made.

It is impossible to exaggerate the importance of the work done in secondary schools; we should not place any more burdens upon the schoolman, but by promoting an appreciation of the inestimable value of his work we may hope to give him a greater degree of independence and a larger share in the management of his own school affairs.

One of the most unfortunate features of school life to-day is that boys do almost no general reading. When they leave school —I might even say when they leave college—their stock of information and their impressions about literature are almost entirely those that have been gained from their tasks and in the classrooms. They have very little general knowledge. They have no fund to draw on for allusions. Preparation for college is assuredly a most unhappy and inadequate means of education if it does not admit of some general culture. However, I do not believe the fault lies with the demands of the colleges. We not infrequently hear that the examinations are so rigorous that there is no time left for other pursuits. This is to be doubted. There can be no question that the colleges do not appreciate the schoolmaster's difficulties, but the removal of these infelicities would not solve all our problems, and I fear this matter of private reading is one of them.

The pastimes are so absorbing that very few young students can develop any literary interests that are independent of class exercises. This is a subject which is very difficult to deal with. If the teacher prescribes a course of reading it becomes at once a task and loses all the virtues which arise from spontaneity. But something should be done to encourage boys to read on their own account. There are few men who do not value the private reading done in their youth far more than many courses they had at school or at college.

The time will come when such topics as "Preparation for College as a Means of Education" will not exist. We shall cease to talk about preparation, about preparatory schools, about requirements for admission, about how best to get a boy into college and such other favorite subjects as seem to be inevitable at present. The time will come when boys will not be *prepared* for

college. They will enter college, but it will be an incident in their lives as natural as passing from one class to another. What is now called the work of preparatory schools will be simply one phase, one period in a man's education. Then the unhappy expression *preparatory* schools will go out of use, and we shall have to invent a more distinguished and dignified name for this our Association. However, this prophecy is for the future. The time is by no means accomplished when college requirements shall pass away. They are necessary as conditions exist at present. Nor should there be any desire that the amount of work done by our schools measured in terms of quality should be decreased in the slightest degree.

The importance of the secondary schools depends upon the importance which the colleges attach to their entrance examinations and certificates. We may hope that some of the glaring inconsistencies will be done away with in the near future. It is also much to be desired that the framers of the college requirements shall learn to express themselves in a manner which will be intelligible to a larger number of people. At the present time there are comparatively few who have the necessary lexicographical, philological, and mathematical knowledge to expound the statements which are issued.

In the meantime, in order to bring about more satisfactory relations between the two departments of education, it is necessary to exact of schoolboys a larger amount of work. In doing this, the number of their so-called amusements must be reduced. Unquestionably there are many schools where industry and good scholarship are the first requisites. But there can be no doubt that on the whole the standards of effort are not as high as they might be. When we have adopted a simpler school-life, and when we fully appreciate the idea that the soundness of scholarship in the schools determines the soundness of scholarship in the higher institutions, then we shall have discovered that our pupils are more than adequately prepared and at the same time have enjoyed the best possible means of education.

PREPARATION FOR COLLEGE AS A MEANS OF EDUCATION.

MISS JESSIE E. ALLEN, PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS.

In one of his fables, La Fontaine has rehearsed the fate of a foolish little frog who stretched and strained and swelled in the hope that she might some day grow to the stature of the stately ox. Need I say that it is with a keen premonition of that little frog's tragic end that I have come to this discussion!

Though it was more than a century ago that Kant wrote, "Education is the greatest and hardest problem which can be proposed to man," there is probably no one present who on reviewing his teaching experience would be tempted to gainsay this. At this time, when the efficiency of the secondary school has come to be measured largely by the preparation which it affords for college, it becomes all friends of higher education to ask how far college preparation offers a solution for this "greatest and hardest problem" of civilization. What are the elements of strength in the college preparatory course? How may they be augmented?

It is necessary to assume at the outset that this question does not concern, save incidentally, the student who goes to college, since he may be reasonably expected to find in that curriculum a means of supplying deficiencies in his preparatory work. The issue rather involves the development and well-being of the pupil whose only school training is to be that obtained in the secondary school. In the case of such a boy or girl, what equipment does college preparation give for that life of usefulness in the community, which is the best justification of any course of study?

The charges commonly brought against college preparation, although diversely stated, express much the same thought. It is said that the course is narrow, the extent of its subject matter is too restricted, that it fails to prepare for life. This last phrase, variously interpreted in the mouths of the multitude who use it, is sometimes understood to mean that the pupil is not fitted for some definite, practical work, thereby assigning to the high school the function of the industrial and trade schools.

In recognizing the fact that schools are for the education of all kinds of people, we are awaking to a realization that it is just as

surely a truism that there must be all kinds of schools to meet these different needs. While it is most emphatically not true that college preparation is only for a chosen few, peculiarly ordained to achieve high grades and distinction for their alma maters in entrance examinations, it is equally certain that there are some members of our high school classes who by reason of mental deficiencies are predestined to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. Grant that such pupils do not find their best opportunity for growth in a literary course of study, but in the industrial school, this does not prove that college preparation fails in the means it affords the great majority of high school pupils of learning how to live happy and worthy lives, inspired by ideals which exalt both labor and pleasure—the great object, according to President Eliot, of education.

In the list of requirements for admission to college, the subject most liable to attack when the content of this course is under discussion is Latin. It is of no practical value, we are told, hence has no place in secondary education. Though this may seem an echo of the commercialism, we are bound to deplore in the life of to-day, it is nevertheless not an imputation to be lightly disregarded. The expansion of commerce, the vast increase of new knowledge resulting from the development of science and of modern literature have, as we all know, affected not only ideas of living, but also ideals of education. How revolutionary this change has been is shown in the fact that whereas fifty years ago Greek, Latin and mathematics marked the extent of the quest after knowledge by the aspirant for college, in the present curriculum the modern languages, science, history, and much English, advance additional claims for consideration. In view, then, of the demands of these more modern and presumably more practical subjects, it may not be out of place to define in exact terms the value of the study of Latin.

It is not my intention at this point to trespass far upon the territory of the classical conference, but to recall briefly the justification which the Latinist finds for his subject. One reason, you remember, lies in the stimulus and help which instruction in this branch affords the pupil in his study of English. The very remoteness of the ideas of the Latin idiom renders the work of translation from the ancient to the modern tongue an exercise which tends to secure clearness, proportion and nice discrimination in ideas and the meanings of words.

Long ago the psychologists attested the value of Latin as an instrument for strengthening the brain centres that must be used when any reasoning is required. More recently a cloud of witnesses has appeared among the scientists. At the conferences held last year at the University of Michigan, the value of humanistic studies as a preparation for the study of medicine, of law, and of theology, was forcefully presented. Dean Vaughan, of the department of medicine and surgery at Michigan, voiced the sentiment of those meetings when he said: "There has been found nowhere a better training for the thinking apparatus of the young than the study of Latin and Greek."[1]

It has gone out of fashion to talk much about mental discipline. Indeed, we are admonished that "the people who operate often with that term are people who have no clear idea of what they mean."[2] It is also counted "immoral" to prescribe work without having first considered the tastes of the pupil. In these latter days, when the path followed by American youth has become the line of least resistance, I find myself sufficiently old-fashioned (or "immoral") to still believe in the efficacy of disciplinary studies for building character as well as for developing brain power. While we cheerfully assent to the teaching of Aristotle that "there are branches of learning which one must study with a view to the enjoyment of leisure," it does not follow that this precept should be made to apply to the pupil between the ages of 13 and 17; neither does it seem desirable that only his tastes and wishes should be consulted in determining his work in the secondary school. Present methods of training, prior to entrance into the high school, do not secure that education of the will which begets power to memorize and to master facts. Much remains for the secondary school to effect in overcoming a tendency to wandering thoughts and desultory habits of work. The alert attention, patient thought and persevering effort which the study of Latin and mathematics tends to develop are factors that facilitate success in life as well as in school. All honor, then, to the colleges that insist on a full measure of these so-called disciplinary branches. The New England Primer and other textbooks for training in morals will be less missed because of their presence in the course.

---

[1] *Michigan Alumnus*, Vol. XIII, 1.

[2] Prof. Goodell, *New Eng. Class Association*, Apr. 6, 1906.

All honor likewise to the educational authorities that have laid greater emphasis on work in English. Though this company may disagree as to the relative importance of mathematics and the classics in the educational scale, there will be no difference of opinion among us as to the value of training in English. A great dean of American learning has thus measured its importance for citizenship: "If this free people to which we belong is to keep its fine spirit, its perfect temper amidst affairs, its high courage in the face of difficulties, its wise temperateness and wide-eyed hope, it must continue to drink deep and often from the old wells of English undefiled, quaff the keen tonic of its best ideals, keep its blood warm with all the utterances of exalted purpose and pure principle of which its matchless literature is full. The great spirits of the past must command us in the tasks of the future. Mere literature will keep us pure and keep us strong."[1]

An antiphon of praise is also due the colleges for bringing science and history into the entrance requirements, and it is an injustice when the demands of other subjects in the secondary roster are permitted to crowd them from their rightful position. History unites with English in setting before our boys and girls the ideals and convictions that have moved the world. But, if through history is to be taught most fully and adequately that highest lesson of citizenship, the lesson of patriotism, the story of achievement ought not to be confined, as is frequently done, to the records of ancient civilizations. Rather the pupil should be thrilled with the story of his own race, and (that the American eagle may not scream too loudly, or with that lack of discernment which sometimes marks the note of this royal bird) to that knowledge should be added, as a basis of comparison, the study of the history of older nations. It is at this point that the assertion that college preparation is narrow, is in a measure justifiable, since it often happens that only a single course in history is given (generally the history of Greece and Rome), and this, because of the time requirement imposed by the colleges, is postponed until the senior year. Teachers of the classics know how the work of the first three years halts because of this postponement.

Yet holding fast to the thought that one object of all education is to make good citizens, some of us would go further and insist that not only should the boy have a wider knowledge of

[1]Dr. Woodrow Wilson, *Mere Literature*, p. 26.

the past, but also some appreciation of the conditions of his own time—the conditions under which he is living, and in the shaping of which he is to have a part.

In an excellent paper read before this Association two years ago concerning the amount of time demanded for the entrance requirements in mathematics, the introduction of civics and economics into the course was urged as a means of developing "that moral and civic sense which is so greatly needed if we are to have good government and better social conditions." Is it not true that this "sense of trusteeship," as President Hadley calls it, represents the supreme need of American life to-day? In its development would surely be found an antidote for the irresponsible action and wilful disregard of the rights of others, which are in large measure accountable for the present social and political disorder. Could a longer step be taken towards its attainment than by giving young people some knowledge of the great fundamental principles of government, and thus inspiring them with that respect for law which lies at the base of all good government? If college preparation falls short in the matter of too little instruction in history, may it not also fail in not offering some special training for law-abiding and honorable citizenship?

Although most, if not all, of us who are called to meet the practical working out of this problem of college preparation year after year in our classrooms are probably agreed that the curriculum is already overweighted, in consideration of the limited time allowed for the performance of the tasks imposed, I have the temerity to think that there is yet another subject which should be included in any broad system of education, but for which college preparation does not provide. That is the subject of music. The fact that this is not made a requirement for college gives it a variant value in different schools, and frequently in the effort to strengthen the work of actual preparation it is swept from the programme altogether. You remember how essential the Greeks deemed it. Plato in his vision of the ideal state taught that musical training "is an instrument of supreme importance, because rhythm and harmony sink deeply into the recesses of the soul, on which they mightily fasten, bringing grace in their train and and making graceful the soul of him who is rightly nurtured,"[1] and Socrates adds that no one can ever become

[1]Plato, *The Republic,* Bk. III.

truly musical until he knows "the essential forms of temperance and courage and liberality, and munificence, with their kindred as well as their opposite forms in all their combinations."[1] Though these old teachings are so old, they are still true to human needs. Whether a few more theorems in geometry are learned, or the first four books of the Gallic wars read, through the very last "Cæsar dixit," can be of no great moment to the pupil in his later years, but it is a matter of vital concern if he shall have missed that training that makes for the widening of the empire of the soul. That he comes into this inheritance of the spirit is his inalienable right.

And next in importance to musical training, Socrates placed the care of the body. With music and gymnastic blended most judiciously there comes "the master of true harmony in the far higher sense than the tuner of strings."[2] The world's work must be done by the strong, and working capacity and health are one. There is probably no occasion to fear that physical training is being neglected by at least one-half of the youthful denizens of the State, but in schools exclusively for girls this work too often suffers for the sake of the college essentials, and is made elective (in which case the class is small) or it is omitted altogether.

As was said at the beginning of this paper, if the student goes on to college or the university, deficiencies in his preparation may be made good. But the great majority who undertake the work of preparing for college never go beyond the secondary school. Furthermore, the policy of ward politicians which crowds classrooms to (and sometimes beyond) their last cubic inch of available oxygen, has unconsciously aided in carrying out the decree of the Committee of Ten that no subject in the secondary curriculum shall be taught in different ways to candidates for freshman honors and to those not going to college. Wise as this judgment undoubtedly was, which refused to discriminate between pupils, it has entailed a crux in thus subjecting boys and girls to methods of instruction which often can only be considered legitimate when regarded as a means to a single end, namely, acquiring a good foundation for work in college. Though it is not a pleasant thing to hear or to say, the best college preparatory

[1]Plato, *The Republic*, Bk. III.
[2]Plato, *The Republic*, Bk. III

schools are, I believe, those which have the most effectual methods of cramming.

Whether the exactions of the entrance examination or of the entrance certificate are to be met, the result is much the same. With the endeavor to cover the ground specified, the work frequently assumes a character which kills any possible enthusiasm or individuality on the part of the class. One reason for the decline of the study of the classics is perhaps to be found in the arid teaching done in many of those classrooms. If the examinations are imminent, the search is for such knowledge as shall be most sustaining under this ordeal. The work necessarily becomes extensive rather than intensive, incompatible with habits of reflective thought, since experience teaches that your class in Greek, after a year's march with the Ten Thousand, and an equally laborious and halting acquisition of a limited military vocabulary, will in all probability be called upon to render into acceptable English "A sophistic attack on Socrates' wisdom and the value of his services to the State," or a paper on some other topic quite as widely removed from the year's experience with the unhappy Ten Thousand. When under the ægis of high scholarship the colleges resort to such expedients of election and selection, what pedagogical crimes may not be committed in the name of college preparation!

On the other hand, if the class is freed from the onus of examinations which are the capricious output of institutions desiring to demonstrate their superior attainments through a limited student body, and if the saner demands of the college board be substituted, there still remains the difficulty of covering the prescribed limits in the allotted time. To accomplish this is often as disastrous for a class composed of the mentally halt and blind as the struggle of preparing for examinations may prove for a class whose mental strength is greater.

Whether, with Kant, we call education training the mind up to an ideal, or hold, with the author of Paracelsus, that it "consists in opening out a way whence the imprisoned splendor may escape," the aim of the school is to develop power, real mental power, and not to turn out people who have been crammed simply with facts. That this has not always been accomplished is shown by the story, often repeated, of the busy little schoolgirl who, when asked if she understood all she was studying so rapidly,

hastened to reply: "Oh, no, sir; we have so much to learn we don't have time to understand it."

The requirements of any curriculum have but a slight claim in comparison with the larger claim of the individual. It should be possible in the college preparatory course, as in any other course, for each class to be treated from the standpoint of its own special capacity and ability, and to be given what it needs most.

And what is the conclusion of the matter? That while we concede the fine training and broad culture of college preparation, we believe that its highest possibilities will not be realized until courses shall be added which bear more directly upon social and economic problems of the day. That no feature of this work is of sufficient importance to justify the exclusion of music and physical training. That methods of instruction which seem to give most satisfactory preparation for college do not necessarily constitute the best training for the class as a whole. And last, that if the present entrance requirements in all their rigidity are to be maintained for the protection of scholarly ideals and the advancement of learning, the highest good will be secured by insisting that candidates for college finish their preparation by private coaching.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

PRESIDENT E. T. JEFFERS, YORK COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE.—There is no necessity of adding a thing to what has already been said on this subject. After reviewing in your minds the very thorough discussion of this morning by both of these papers, and going back to the important and thoroughly philosophical and complete discussion of the subject last night as an ideal, what more can be said? "What can the man do that cometh after the king?"

I liked that speech of Doctor Wilson, and we all did. It was thorough and complete. I heard him speak on the same subject two years ago; he was good enough to come down and give us some ideas on education in our Pennsylvania Academy Principals' Association. I remember some things he said there then, something of the same tenor as he gave us last night. I remem-

ber the part of his speech which he says we always remember; I remember his stories. Those stories were good; he did not hint that he had any patent on them, and so I captured a few of them and have used them since, largely, and they always take with any audience. They are good stories, but what is true of the stories is more abundantly true of the principles that he laid down there. College preparatory work; the word "preparation," a bugbear and a hindrance? Why, what is there that we do anywhere that is not preparatory work? Everything we undertake is simply a preparation for something better; the freshman work is preparation for sophomore work, and so on through; and when we finish the college course we have commencement, and that is only the beginning. "Commence bachelor," they used to say in the English universities; we only commence life, and what year is there that is not a preparation for the next?

Calvé, the celebrated singer, said to her fellow-citizens in that quiet little hamlet in France: "You are happy; you envy me; but I must constantly be studying how to please and filled with worries in view of the coming performances."

What is there that is not preparatory? The idea of preparation does not take away anything from the educational value of any subject that is studied. So I shall not worry about taking that word "preparatory" out of our association name or out of anything else.

The preparation for college is education. That is the subject. It does not say that it is the best educational instrument, the best means of education; that is not said; but I would be perfectly willing to take that statement; at least I don't know any other line of study that could be pursued during the four years after the boy is through with the studies of the grades that could educate him better, and so I am prepared to go the whole length of the statement of this theme to-day. We are discussing preparation for college, not rush for college. That is a different thing. We are not talking about that. We are talking of preparation for college, and the true preparatory school does not rush. Occasionally there are instances in which boys are anxious to be prepared in a brief time, and they are permitted to rush, but the school does not rush students for entrance into college.

Perhaps it is necessary to redefine, as Doctor Wilson did so ably last night, the terms of this question. "Preparation for College as

a Means of Education"; that does not mean preparation for a machine shop, nor preparation for a school where farming is taught, nor preparation for a school where bookkeeping and penmanship are taught, nor preparation for the collection of citizens in our State capitals who elect our Presidents; all those things are called colleges, every one of them. We are not talking about preparation for those things. Preparation for some of them is not eminently educational.

What is college? We are drifting away from the meaning of college, because so many things are called colleges. Look at the Standard Dictionary and you will find "college" is defined as "An institution for instruction in the liberal arts." And the line of study is quite definitely fixed; the term is four years, and the college course ends with a degree, generally bachelor of arts or bachelor of science. That is the definition given there, and then the studies are named: mathematics, Latin, Greek, French, German, metaphysics, history and some others associated with them. Now, preparation for admission to college includes just about what our association has fixed: four years of Latin, three years of Greek or some other language, some history, some one science, possibly two, chemistry or physics, the study of the English classics. These are the main subjects of study during the preparatory years.

Now, I thoroughly agree with the President that this is educational, and not only that, but it is a part of education that has no right to be set off at the beginning of the college course as inferior in any respect to the education that is given in the college. All is education, keeping the definition of college in mind and keeping the word preparatory in mind. It is said we must teach principles and not facts. Now, that sounds like a bromide; we have heard it before. A man may use it and still not be a bromide; he may be a sulphide if he uses it and knows what he is talking about. How in the world are we going to teach principles without facts? How shall we teach the law of gravity without the facts that illustrate that law and that are accounted for by the law? How are we going to teach Latin literature without the grammatical facts? Why, a large part of education is imparting facts—cold, solid and hard, and many times absolutely uninteresting facts. They must be learned, and the teacher must insist on their being learned, and he must have tact enough

to persuade the pupil to learn them and perseverance enough to hold the pupil to them until he gets them. That is a part of education, to learn what is hard. To teach what is easy, there is no difficulty in that, but there is no product found when you get through with it. It is comparatively worthless.

Boys often say, "What is the use of studying Latin?" I say, "Because it is hard." That is a use of it, one use of it, and the only use that some boys can see. They never appreciate anything except the hardness. But that is the merit of that language to them. If you say that the study of the Latin language is of no use to a fellow who is going to become a machinist, or a blacksmith, or a farmer, I say most emphatically it is of use to him, and he above all others should study it. If he is not going to college he should have those four years of Latin, and I would put more emphasis on giving those four years to him than to any boy that is going to college. Those who are going into trades and mechanical professions are the ones who need the culture that comes from these four years of college preparatory work more than others do. I know that some people think that there are students who are absolutely incapable of acquiring Latin. I have had boys under my care that made me think of the Irishman who was kicked by a mule and a physician examined his injuries. A friend standing by walked off and met another friend who said, "Is Pat badly hurt?" The physician had said that he had suffered a compound fracture of the *os frontis* and a few more things in those terms which physicians are acustomed to use, and the Irishman who had heard him said to his friend, "Indade he is bad hurt; all his Latin parts are smashed up," and I have got hold of boys who I thought had met a mule at the aggressive end: all their Latin parts seemed to have been thoroughly demolished, but a little perseverance, even with the most hopeless case, generally leads to the discovery that any boy of ordinary ability can acquire the Latin, and if perseverance enough is used by the teacher, and if the parents will permit the teacher—I don't say if the parent will help him—but if he will only permit the teacher to use that perseverance with the boy, he can learn Latin.

Now, I know the objection to this; it has cropped out here and there along our discussions, but has not been very openly stated, that these four years of college preparatory work do not

fit a boy for earning his living and do not fit a girl for earning her living, and therefore it is not education. The object of education is to fit a pupil for earning a living! What an idea! I had supposed it would be impossible for any member of this association to affirm that and believe it. I should hope that every member of this association and every educator in the United States would set himself firmly against any such notion, and whenever it is uttered would enter a protest with all the vigor of righteous indignation against it. "Education fits a man for earning a living!" Why, a man can earn a living without an education. Anybody can earn a living that is willing to work. Why, a mule can earn a living, and he has a right to his oats and his hay, and has a right to kick if he is not well treated; he earns, he deserves it. Anybody can earn a living, and to put into pupils' heads the idea that education is intended to fit them for earning a living is an abomination; it vitiates life at its very fountain; it is a cancer on our educational system that will eat out its vitals. You hold that idea before pupils all their days and you raise up a generation that will produce neither patriots nor Christians.

We are to teach boys how to make a life, not a living. The greater includes the less. I believe that a thoroughly educated man makes a better living than one that is not educated. I take education in the sense in which I have just used it here: the development of power, including information, orientation and discipline, as the president gave it to us last night. I believe a thoroughly intelligent man will earn a better living than a man that is not educated; the average educated man will do that. Salaries are higher and pay for labor is higher in an intelligent community than it is in one where intelligence is at a low ebb; but that is not the aim of education, and it is a vicious thing to hold that up as the aim; it weakens the pupil, it brings the tone of instruction down, it fosters the mistaken notion held by some boards of directors, and is the enemy of the best life and the best citizenship wherever and whenever it is uttered.

Boards of directors of public schools are elected by the people; they are politicians, and they are always after practical subjects, and all that, and some say we must humor them and must let them have their way. Must we? Are we such weaklings, we teachers, that we cannot determine what is best for those whom

God has put under our care to be instructed? I hope not. It is our place to produce public sentiment enough to insure educational subjects in our high school course. We have no right to permit the children to be robbed of their privilege by men who do not know what they are doing in injuring the pupils by permitting them to take the practical course, as they view it, that they wish to take. Do we let children at the table live on caromels because they wish caromels more than beefsteak? It is just as sensible to allow boys and girls in a high school to take what they like as it would be to treat them in that way at the table. We can influence boys, even politicians, and we ought to do it, and we ought not to rest until we do it. I find some every year of those who wish to get into college in the easiest possible way, and who find those things called colleges that do not require Latin, and require very little else except mathematics in order to enter. I always think of the man who went up to the ticket office and asked for a ticket to Springfield. The ticket agent said, "What Springfield; Springfield, Illinois, or Massachusetts?" and named two or three other Springfields. "Oh, well," the fellow drawled, "which is the cheapest?"

I have looked right into the face of a boy whose father has sent him to school with a catalogue in his hand of an institution called a college that required the least, with the request that I would fit him for that particular thing. Of course, if he insists on it, and that is all I can get him for, I will take him, because I think we can get some good ideas into his head in the course of a year or two years that it will require even for him to fit for that college. I will take him and do my best for him, but it will go hard with me if I do not persuade him before long that there is something better in life than merely earning bread and butter.

What is the motive we ought to hold before the pupils, something which is definite? I think any pupils of ordinary intelligence can be convinced that there is something higher than simply earning a living; that they owe it to the community and to their parents and to God to make the most of themselves and to fit themselves for doing some service to the Church and the State beyond what they are paid for. No man is a good citizen who is paid for all he does. We ought to teach them to fit themselves for doing more than any State can pay them for. With that idea they will be no less well prepared for college than if they

have the simple notion that they fit for college in order that college may enable them to earn a better living and earn it easier.

So, Mr. President, I am on the affirmative of this question. I am not foolish enough to suppose that I have converted any fellow-pedagogue by what I have said; I know you too well for that, but I should not have established my claim to a place among you if I had not taken the privilege which the committee gave me of expressing my sentiments.

PROF. WILLIAM ADDISON HERVEY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—It seems to me that Miss Allen has in her paper a point that is worth further discussion. Perhaps it has already been before the association. As this is the first meeting of the association which I have attended as a delegate, you will pardon me if I bring up something that has been sufficiently discussed. I refer to the objection which she makes to the time limit imposed by many colleges; that is to say, the requirement that all examinations shall have been passed within a certain time of the candidate's admission, usually sixteen months. That is a distinct hardship, and it seems to me a totally unnecessary one. It is not necessary that the candidate should know, at the time he enters college, the content of his whole preparatory course, any more than we require him, when we give him the bachelor's degree, to know all of his four years' college work. How many students know their solid geometry and their Horace well enough to obtain a mark of 60 per cent. at the end of the college course? In some colleges, as you know—Harvard, for example—they have absolutely removed the time limit; at Columbia we have put it at twenty-eight months, which means that a candidate can begin his examinations at the end of the second high school year, and it seems to me that therein lies an easy remedy for the difficulty complained of. He can then offer part of his mathematics and Latin and perhaps two years of a modern language. The work of those who are not going to college need not be disturbed by the cramming of those subjects in the third and fourth years. Let each of these years be devoted solely to the work in hand, and the advantage of both the candidates for college and the others can be best served.

Without wishing to return to the discussion of yesterday, I would say a word on that matter (admission by certificate), be-

cause of its connection with what I am now speaking of. The easiest way to carry out the plan suggested would be to have the candidates for college take, at the end of the second, third and fourth years, the examinations that have been established through the agency of this board, or in New York State, if they choose, those of the State Examination Board. These examinations could be accepted by the schools in lieu of theirs, so that the pupil would be relieved of the ordeal of two examinations. This, it seems to me, is an easy solution, and infinitely preferable to the certificate, of which I should never, under any circumstances, approve. Admission to college should rest upon approximate uniformity of standards, but that is only assured by the administration of uniform examinations, such as those conducted by the two boards. An inherent weakness of the certificate system, however administered, is that it depends too much upon the widely varying judgment of one or two men for each boy or small group of boys admitted. The certificate, though granted by the principal on the basis of the reports of his teachers, nevertheless is, in many cases, at the end a matter of individual judgment. When the boy comes to college, if the system of the New England association, as described yesterday, is adopted, it is then upon the judgment of three or four instructors who have known the boy only a few weeks, and have no criterion but his work in that period, that the reputation of the principal and his school depends, so far as that college is concerned. I am heartily in favor of a certificate system, of a certificate *in addition to* the examination. We who have to judge of the admission of boys to college should be very glad to have certificates from their teachers or principals, and to have these come not with the boy, not in the boy's hands, but independently from the school to the college of his choice, certificates in which detailed, *confidential* information is given. All cases on the line, even some below the line, could be adjusted on the basis of that valuable information; but to rest the *whole* case on a certificate and on the boy's performance in the first term I believe is wrong; it puts a burden on the schools and a burden on the instructors in the freshman class which they should not be asked to bear.

Whether this matter of recommending that all colleges be asked to accept examinations passed twenty-eight months before admission has already come up I don't know. If not, perhaps

some one will think well enough of the suggestion to offer it as a resolution.

MR. J. G. CROSWELL, THE BREARLEY SCHOOL.—Perhaps you will pardon me for taking a couple of minutes. It seems to me that, though our meeting has been quite philosophical, it has been on the whole rather gloomy. All yesterday morning we discussed the question how foolish a doctor of philosophy would probably be as a teacher, with an implication that he was certain not to be a good teacher.

I think it may be true that doctors of philosophy, highly trained in the scientific method, are not idiotic, but, as Anthony Hope says, quite highly specialized; nevertheless, I do not think that doctors of philosophy are usually inferior teachers; quite the contrary; nor do I think that a course in the history of education or in the training of teachers or in the best method of teaching would ever enable a foolish person to teach. I cannot see how one fool teaching another fool could ever learn, by pedagogy, to make them both wise.

Then in the afternoon we discussed fools again. "Which is the most noxious fool, the one who is rejected by the admission examination or the one who is certified in by his teacher?" Both of those discussions are necessary, but, after all, 99 per cent. of all applicants do pass the examinations; most of our pupils are successful; the education of American youth is not in such a dangerous condition as our discussion of yesterday afternoon would certainly lead one to feel.

And then that interesting young gentleman who was introduced to us by President Wilson as the orator of the evening I think illuminated the subject, not with the light of day, but possibly with a blue light occasionally. We all looked pretty haggard. "We never educate"; "Our pupils are not educated." I can believe that of my pupils, but I cannot believe it of President Wilson's. And when he turned the light on himself I have to deny the truth of the picture. I have never heard him speak five minutes that I was not informed, educated, encouraged and uplifted, until last night.

As to this morning, I thought at last we had a Joan of Arc; that the men might be frightened (as they often are), but, like Queen Elizabeth, or Catharine of Russia, the women could not

be frightened; they would stay by us, and Miss Allen almost did. Still, even she did not quite say what I want to say: I think our work is prosperous; I think we are the hope and leaders of the next generation in America. It is our duty to run out ahead of the generation in the skirmish line, to feel the enemy and to head the forlorn hopes, and though we are hard worked, and though our work does seem at times unsuccessful, I am sure

"When the forts of folly fall
They'll find our bodies by the wall."

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS.

First Session, Friday, November 29th.

The president appointed the following temporary committees:

On Nominations: Principal William W. Birdsall, of the Philadelphia High School for Girls; President Thomas Fell, of St. John's College; President Rush Rhees, of the University of Rochester; Mr. Wilson Farrand, headmaster of Newark Academy, and Mr. Walter R. Marsh, headmaster of St. Paul's School.

On Audit: President Isaac Sharpless, of Haverford College, and Principal Virgil Prettyman, of the Horace Mann School.

Fourth Session, Saturday, November 30th.

DR. JOHN B. KIEFFER, Treasurer, read his report, as follows:

To the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland.

GENTLEMEN: I present herewith my report of the condition of the treasury of your association for the year 1906-07, as embodied in the accompanying detailed statement of receipts and disbursements, together with the necessary records and vouchers.

The receipts for the year amounted to $1,521.42, and the disbursements to $933.55, leaving in my hands to-day a balance of $587.87, to which will be added, in January next, when the interest on the certificate of the Farmers' Trust Company, of Lancaster, Pa., falls due, the sum of $17.50, making the entire amount of balance in my hands $605.37. The expenses of the association again somewhat exceeded the income, so that this balance is $41.05 less than the balance reported last year.

I append a summary of receipts and disbursements, as follows:

RECEIPTS.

Balance in hand November 29th, 1906	$625 42
Interest on certificate of deposit	21 00
Membership dues for 1904-05, 2 schools	10 00
Membership dues for 1905-06, 8 schools	40 00
Membership dues for 1906-07, 162 schools	810 00
Membership dues for 1907-08, 3 schools	15 00
Amount of receipts	$1,521 42

DISBURSEMENTS.

For Executive Committee's expenses.....	$18 82	
For reporters, typewriters, clerks, etc.....	107 38	
For postage, expressage and labor.....	155 54	
For printing and stationery.....	456 41	
For expenses of College Entrance Certificate Board	45 40	
For salaries of secretary and treasurer.....	150 00	
		$933 55
Leaving in my hands a balance of.....		$587 87
The accounts balancing.....		$1,521 42

The interest which will be due in January next, as stated above, will increase this balance to $605.37.

Of the colleges and schools holding membership in your Association, one has paid no dues for 1904-05; five for 1905-06, and fourteen for 1906-07. Of this amount of $100.00, possibly two-thirds will be paid during the coming year.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN B. KIEFFER, *Treasurer.*

Lancaster, Pa., November 27th, 1907.

The Auditing Committee reported as follows:

The committee appointed to audit the accounts of John B. Kieffer, treasurer, have compared the payments with his vouchers and find them correct, there being a balance in his hands due the association of $587.87. The treasurer also holds a certificate on which interest amounting to $17.50 will be due January 12th, 1908.

VIRGIL PRETTYMAN,
ISAAC SHARPLESS.

The Nominating Committee reported as follows:

For officers of the Association for the ensuing year we suggest the following gentlemen:

President, Mr. James G. Croswell, Master of the Brearley School, New York City.

Vice-Presidents, President John H. Harris, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.; Dean Thomas M. Balliet, New York

University, New York; Principal Walter B. Gunnison, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Principal Charles S. Crossman, Haverford School, Haverford, Pa.; Principal Edward C. Wilson, Friends' School, Baltimore, Md.

Secretary, Prof. Arthur H. Quinn, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Treasurer, Prof. John B. Kieffer, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

Executive Committee, President Woodrow Wilson, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.; Prof. Nelson G. McCrea, Columbia University, New York City; Principal Charles D. Larkins, Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Principal Virgil Prettyman, Horace Mann High School, New York City.

The Secretary was, on motion, instructed to cast a ballot in the name of the Association for the above-named officers, and they were accordingly declared elected.

The Secretary reported for the Executive Committee that it had admitted the Eastern High School, of Baltimore; the Western High School, of Baltimore; Penn Hall, Chambersburg, Pa.; the Horace Mann High School, New York City; the Lansdowne High School, Lansdowne, Pa., and Washington and Jefferson Academy, Washington, Pa., to membership in the association.

The President then announced the appointment of the representatives of the Association on the College Entrance Examination Board, as follows: Messrs. James G. Croswell, Brearley School, New York; Wilson Farrand, Newark Academy, Newark; James L. Patterson, Chestnut Hill Academy, Philadelphia, Pa.; John H. Denbigh, Morris High School, New York; Francis A. Soper, Baltimore City College, Baltimore, Md.

Report of the Delegate of the Association to the National Conference Committee of the Associations of Colleges and Preparatory Schools.

The President.—The report of the delegate of the Association to the National Conference Committee of the Associations of Colleges and Preparatory Schools has been printed and circulated among the members of the Association. I think many copies have been circulated since the Association assembled. If it is the pleasure of the Association, that report can be read. I think Mr.

Farrand was present at that conference, and I should like to ask if he would like to say anything or would like to have the report read.

MR. WILSON FARRAND.—I think it is hardly necessary. Professor Ames was the delegate of this Association; I was the delegate of the College Entrance Examination Board. At the last moment Mr. Ames telegraphed me that he could not be present and asked me to be present. This committee is taking steps to make itself a permanent organization, and it looks as though in the near future it might be a very efficient instrument in the cooperation of these various associations.

As a matter of record the following extracts from the report are printed:

"Williamstown, Mass., June 28, 1907.

"The committee assembled in formal session at the home of Professor Morton at 8.30 P. M., President MacLean, Professor Lord, Mr. Farrand (representing both the College Entrance Examination Board and the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland), Dean Ferry and Professor Morton being present.

"Mr. Farrand reported that the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland had appointed a committee to consider the advisability of the organization of a college entrance certificate board or a commission for accrediting schools, as recommended in the resolution on that subject adopted at the Williamstown Conference of August 3 and 4, 1906.

"Professor Lord then proposed the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That this committee accepts with much gratification the report of this action of the Middle States Association as given by Mr. Farrand.

"The resolution was unanimously adopted.

"June 29, 1907.

"Professor Lord moved the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That the purpose of this committee shall be to consider requirements for admission, matters of mutual interest to universities, colleges, and preparatory schools, and such other questions as may be referred to it by the associations.

"The resolution was unanimously adopted.

"President MacLean reported that a letter had been received from an organization of teachers of physics asking that action be taken by this committee concerning the admission requirement in that subject. After discussion, Mr. Farrand presented a resolution as follows:

"*Resolved,* That this committee recommends the action of the College Entrance Examination Board in calling upon the Associations of Colleges and Preparatory Schools to co-operate in the formation of a new entrance requirement in physics, and urges those associations to accept the invitation.

"The resolution was unanimously adopted.

"Professor Lord moved the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That this committee recommends that both the inspection of the preparatory schools and the record made in college during the first term or semester of the freshman year by the pupils from such schools be the basis for granting the accrediting or the certificate privilege.

"The resolution was unanimously adopted.

"Dean Ferry presented a resolution as follows:

"*Resolved,* That this committee recommends that, in the transfer of collegiate students, the following points be considered in determining the standing of the colleges or universities concerned:

"(1) the requirements for admission;

"(2) the grade and amount of work required, the length of the course, the character of the curriculum, and the degrees conferred;

"(3) the number and qualifications of the instructors and the proportion of instructors to students;

"(4) the separation of the Collegiate Faculty from the government and the instruction of a preparatory department;

"(5) the acceptance of the graduates by the graduate schools;

"(6) equipment; and

"(7) endowment.

"The resolution was unanimously adopted."

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COLLEGE ENTRANCE CERTIFICATE BOARD.

THE PRESIDENT.—We will now consider the report made yes-

terday by the Committee on the Establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board for the Middle States and Maryland. Is Doctor Crawley present?

MR. WILSON FARRAND.—In the absence of Professor Crawley, the chairman, and in behalf of the committee, I rise to make a series of motions designed to carry into effect the recommendations of the committee. As a preliminary, I move that the report of the committee be accepted.

THE PRESIDENT.—The report submitted yesterday? Are there any remarks upon this motion? If not, all in favor will say aye. Opposed, no. The report is accepted.

MR. FARRAND.—I then move that the Executive Committee of this Association appoint a committee (the number to be left to the discretion of the Executive Committee) to take preliminary steps for the organization of a College Entrance Certificate Board of the Middle States and Maryland. That motion is purposely made without any restriction as to details, in order that that committee may act in its wisdom and as it finds the necessity for the case arise. It is our thought that that committee will probably ask all the colleges of the Middle States and Maryland that desire to join in such course to send delegates to a meeting, and that these delegates will adopt a constitution for the proposed board and put the board into operation.

I think that is all the explanation that is necessary, but should be glad to answer any further questions. The idea is to leave it in the hands of the colleges concerned to organize the board.

The motion was seconded.

THE PRESIDENT.—Any remarks upon this motion?

MR. VIRGIL PRETTYMAN.—I desire to ask whether that is to be a committee with power, or is it to report back to this Association for action?

MR. FARRAND.—I intended to make the motion in such form that this committee would have the power to take the necessary steps for calling together the colleges for the purpose of forming

this board. They will do that at their early convenience, I presume, so that the board could be organized this winter.

THE PRESIDENT.—So that our vote on Mr. Farrand's motion is for the formation of such a committee.

MR. ROBERT H. WRIGHT, EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL OF BALTIMORE.—May I ask why it is that none of the preparatory schools are to be represented on this board?

MR. FARRAND.—We have a series of motions. That will be provided for in the next motion.

PROF. NELSON G. MCCREA, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—As I understand the situation, if Mr. Farrand's motion should be carried, it would commit this Association as an association, and consequently, to a certain extent, by implication, all the members of the Association, both colleges and schools, to a support of the project of the establishment of such a certificating board. If every member of the Association—every official member of the Association—were here represented by a delegate duly authorized to cast its vote for or against the formation of such a board, my present suggestion would certainly be inapropos; but it seems to me that a step of such importance should not be taken without a clear understanding being arrived at on the part of all the parties concerned.

So far at least as my conversation has gone there are a certain number of schools and a certain number of colleges, members of this Association, that take somewhat the position—some of them precisely the same position—that President Wilson took yesterday: that, inasmuch as they regard the certificate system as inadvisable, they are on the whole opposed to the organization of an inadvisable thing; they are on the whole opposed to any step which would obscure the inadvisability of the thing, and I ask, therefore, the question whether it would not be perhaps a safer method (although it would take, of course, a little more time) if, prior to the authorization to be given to any committee to form such a board or to take preliminary steps toward the formation of such a board, a vote should be obtained through correspondence with all the members of the association to see exactly how

the individual members stand and where; to give every opportunity to them officially to express their approval or disapproval of the project.

MR. WILLIAM W. BIRDSALL, PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS.—In the programme of this meeting which was circulated throughout the territory covered by the Association a definite place was assigned to this proposition. It has been before the Association at one previous meeting at least, and has been somewhat discussed. It seems to me that every institution which is a member of this Association has had due notice that the matter was to come before this meeting this year, and therefore it seems to me that no one's rights are in any way trodden upon if we vote upon the question now and here.

If this were a question of adopting a certificate system I think we might hold a very different view upon it; that is not the question at all; by far the larger number of colleges represented in this Association already receive students upon certificate.

The system is adopted; it is here; it is a part of our arrangement, and the proposition now before us is that we shall put this arrangement in such systematic form as to reduce to a minimum the evils attendant upon it.

As to an argument upon the system itself, after an experience of a good many years in several different schools, and a few upon the other side of the situation, I am prepared to say that, according to my experience, the certificating system lands in the college just as well-prepared students as the examination system. So far as I have known schoolmen they have been honest in their certificates; their statements could be relied on, and I do not believe that any man could administer the affairs of a large public school sending pupils to a number of different colleges—in fact, to all the leading colleges for women and some others—I do not believe that anybody who has studied the situation from year to year and seen the joy with which good students escaped the ordeal of examinations for admission to college and the strain that that examination is upon people who can stand the strain the least; I do not believe that any candid person can study the situation without believing that there is at least a place for a certificating system for admission to college.

DEAN W. H. CRAWSHAW, COLGATE UNIVERSITY.—It hardly seems necessary for us to settle the whole question of the relative merits of the examination and the certificate systems. The fact is, as we all know, that there are two great systems of admission to college, the examination system and the certificate system. Probably those of us having most to do with the certificate system will not be able to change the attitude of the universities which hold to the examination system. I think it is just as probable that the examining universities will not be able to change the attitude of those that use the certificate system. What we want is action which will put the certificate system (to which we must in some measure submit, whether we believe in it or not) on the best possible basis, and the action that is proposed looks toward that end.

I should like to add that I think it will be extremely regrettable if there is not something done in connection with this series of motions and actions looking toward an expansion of the work beyond the jurisdiction of the association which we particularly represent here this morning. It is very desirable that such a board as this should have a wider scope, and we ought to look toward union with other boards, or toward co-operation with other boards. As to the main question which is now before us, I hope that the motion will be passed, because, whatever we may think about the relative merits of the two systems of admission to cellege, certification is here, and we want the very best kind of certification.

THE PRESIDENT.—The Secretary suggests that the committee's report be read again, as long as there are several members present this morning who were not present yesterday.

The Secretary read the report. See page 40.

MR. ROBERT H. WRIGHT.—There is underlying all of this a pedagogical question that I wanted to ask Doctor Lord's opinion on yesterday, but there were so many others who wanted to ask question that I didn't get an opportunity. This Association is to represent the high schools; I presume that is what you mean by the "Preparatory Schools" in the name of this Association, *i. e.*, what Commissioner Brown calls the "Middle School." Only about ten per cent. of our pupils ever reach college. From my

school was sent last year exactly ten per cent. of its graduates; ninety per cent. do not enter. The curricula of the high schools, therefore, must be made with other than preparing students for college in view. The question of entering college appeals to only about 10 per cent., so we who are in the high school are confronted with a big problem, a much larger one than you seem to realize in this Association. For, in the first place, the work in the grades has been lowered and we have to lower our point of beginning; in the second place, the colleges are continually raising—or have been—the requirements for admission, and we have to stretch to reach that point. Now, there is only a certain amount of work that can be done as it should be done in four years, and that is the time usually allotted to the high school. Our president yesterday said we in the high school are not only held responsible for the work in the grammar grades and the high schools, but also for the misteaching in the first half year of the colleges. Then if we establish this accrediting system the question becomes, "Shall the high school principal's responsibilities end when his students graduate from the high school, or shall they end at the end of the first half year of their instruction in college?"

Here is the question I wanted to ask Doctor Lord yesterday: If we had this system (schools are going to try to be placed upon the accredited list) will it not have the tendency to make us shape our curricula and change our schools from the great people's college to simply college preparatory institutions? If it will have that effect I am opposed to it, bitterly opposed to it.

I firmly believe that it is the business of the colleges to come down to the place where the high schools carry their students. You people in the colleges have your institutions open at the wrong end. It is too hard to get in and too easy to get out when you once get in. A college diploma too often means simply four years' residence at some college. And that is about all it does mean, for you exclude from the college all except those who can go through very easily in four years. You should give an opportunity to a great number who would make good college material to get in.

Now, if this resolution is going to make us establish a system that will affect, as I have indicated, the curricula of the preparatory schools and change us from our purpose, to simply college

preparatory institutions, then I am opposed to it; and I hope all who think as I do will vote against it now; for it may be too late at our next meeting.

MR. JEFFERS.—I hope this action will compel all high schools that cannot be taught by any other method, to raise their instructions to the level of college preparatory work; and I also hope that the resolution will pass.

ISAAC SHARPLESS.—If voting affirmatively on this resolution would seem to commit this Association to the plan of entrance to college by certificate, I should wish to vote against it also. I don't understand that this will be the case at all. It is simply that the committee desires to make the best of a bad way of entering college.

PROF. W. A. HERVEY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—It seems to be generally admitted, even by the friends and supporters of the certificate system, that it has evils; we hear that on all sides—it *has* evils. It is a question of correcting the evils, of making them not quite as bad as they are now. That being admitted, it seems to me wholly unfit for this association to go on record as countenancing officially and authorizing, in the establishment of this board, the perpetuation of that system. This Association itself has established a College Entrance Examination Board which obviates all the difficulties that were urged against the old examination system. In the old days, when a boy had to cram up his whole four years' work and come up in June of the last year and pass in all subjects, or make up his deficiencies in September—and that was his only chance—it was quite a different matter. So, too, when it must all be done within sixteen months. He may now have a chance to satisfy college entrance requirements from the end of the second high school year on. The ordeal of entrance examinations, that are said to be so feared by the pupils, is not such a serious matter if they are given in that way. The examination is taken at the school, or in the pupil's own town, and is substituted for the examination of the school in that year.

Furthermore, there is in this certificate question another principle involved: that we must not constantly seek to exempt the

high school boys and girls from all difficulty, all hardship, all tests. They will have to meet them later, and if they get no preparation for them in the school, where are they going to get it?

Accordingly, I feel that the adoption of this resolution at this time would put a bar in the way of a needed reform. Many of the colleges, and I am sure a great many of the schools, want the certificate system abolished. It is a matter of courage, as President Rhees said yesterday—it is a matter of courage and a matter of policy. Colleges all want students; they are there to get students, and if one admits by certificate, why, others feel they must follow suit. The adoption of this resolution at this time would, I think, put a barrier in the way that would be very difficult to get rid of later, and I hope all who are opposed to the certificate system will see it in that light and take the position which the speaker a few moments ago, representing a high school, took, namely, to postpone the question—to lay it over for another year.

President Rush Rhees, University of Rochester.—If Professor Hervey understood me yesterday to be opposed to the certificate system I misrepresented my own convictions. I did undertake honestly to acknowledge that evil inheres in the present administration of the certification system. I undertook, however, to express the conviction that under proper organization it is easily conceivable that the certification system may be superior to any examination system. That is the ground on which some of the colleges possibly are wanting now in courage, but they are certainly earnestly seeking wisdom; they have got the certification system, and the statement that was made not long ago is certainly true that the failure of this Association to authorize the appointing of this committee is not going to act as a persuasive to the colleges that believe in the certification system to abandon that system in favor of the examination system. Such a failure will merely demonstrate what might possibly be inferred without further demonstration, that it might have been wiser to have had in conference on this subject those who at the outset believe in the system and its possibilities.

Personally, I sincerely hope that the motion presented by the committee will prevail. However, it seems to me that it would

be a mistake to have it prevail with the notion that the adoption of the motion by this Association in anywise whatever commits any institution, school, or college in the Association to the approval of the certification system if that school or college does not approve of it, any more than membership in this Association commits any member of the Association to the adoption of the examinations of the College Entrance Examination Board because that college is a member of the Association. I think it is the function of this Association to appoint a committee if it chooses. I hope it will so choose to do; but I do not think that such an action will commit the Association or any member on the question whether or not the certification system is in itself preferable to any other system.

THE PRESIDENT.—Are you ready that the motion should be put?

The question was called for, the motion put and carried.

MR. FARRAND.—I now move that the Executive Committee of the Association be authorized to appoint five representatives of secondary schools to take part in the organization of the College Certificate Board. I would add that this is the last of the series of motions. If this is passed it will provide that every college in this district that wishes to join such a certificate board will send its delegates to a meeting to be called by the committee that has already been authorized; that at that meeting there will be present five representatives of the secondary schools, appointed by this association; that body will draw up a permanent constitution for the College Certificate Board, and will put it into operation. It will then remain for that body to decide whether it will have, according to the recommendation of our committee, a permanent representation from secondary schools or not. We have tested, I think, pretty well the sentiment; and we feel that it probably will so provide. The question of reciprocity with the other districts, with the College Certificate Board in New England and that in the North Central States, would then rest with this body; but I may state that the other two organizations are ready to establish such reciprocity as soon as the board in this district is organized. The only point of delicacy that I can see in regard to the motion I have just made is that we appoint five

representatives of the secondary schools to take part in this organization meeting. If at the organization meeting it should be decided that they did not want secondary school representatives in the permanent body, it might be a slap in the face of those who have been appointed. At the same time, I think that probably the Association's five representatives who are to be appointed would be entirely willing to run that risk.

The motion was carried.

THE PRESIDENT.—Is there any new business?

DEAN W. H. CRAWSHAW.—Mr. Farrand has just said that this question of reciprocity (in which, as you see, I am interested) would be left to the proposed conference. It seems to me, however, that it might be a desirable thing for this Association to express its conviction that such reciprocity ought to be sought, and, if any practical way can be found, achieved. I therefore beg leave, Mr. President, to move, sir, that it be the sense of this meeting that the proposed conference of colleges and preparatory schools shall seek, so far as a practicable method can be found, union or co-operation with the similar boards of other associations.

THE PRESIDENT.—Are there any remarks?

MR. FARRAND.—Might I say, in explanation of my remark that the door was open, this National Conference Committee of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools had on it representatives of the New England Certificate Board, and also of the North Central Association. That conference committee at its meeting a year ago last summer—the first meeting—recommended this Association of the Middle States to form a Certificate Board, and further passed a resolution—I forget the words, and I have not the printed form in my hands—recommending that these various boards, when established, should carry out this idea of reciprocity. The general method of carrying that out was discussed; and at the meeting last summer, at which Professor Lord was a delegate from the New England Board, the methods were discussed in detail so that the way is entirely open.

PRINCIPAL VIRGIL PRETTYMAN, HORACE MANN HIGH SCHOOL.—Probably all of you are aware that during the past two years at least two associations in the East have given much time to the consideration of the quantitative side of the college entrance requirements. A member of our own Association, Mr. Farrand, has presented at least two papers within the last two years on this subject. His papers are an exceedingly able treatment of the subject. The Schoolmasters' Association of New York and Vicinity gave eighteen months to the consideration of this question, and the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools has appointed a committee to consider it. It seems wise that this Association should during the coming year study this question, possibly in conjunction with the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools. Believing this, I present the following resolution: "That the Executive Committee of this Association appoint a committee consisting of six representatives of the colleges and six representatives of the secondary schools to consider the whole question of the quantity of college entrance requirements, and to report at the next meeting of the Association."

The motion was carried.

PRESIDENT STAHR, FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE.—Sometimes this Association has determined where the next meeting should be held; sometimes the question has been referred to the Executive Committee. I should like, Mr. President, to remind this Association that it was organized—this is our twenty-first meeting, I believe—twenty years ago, and that the first meeting was held at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, at Franklin and Marshall College. The late Dr. Thomas G. Apple was then president of the college; and I think it was through his instrumentality and Dr. Magill's, of Swarthmore, that the Association of Colleges in Pennsylvania was first organized; subsequently it became the association which is now the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland. I should like to extend a cordial invitation to the Association to meet again at Franklin and Marshall College at Lancaster. The Association has not been there since it was organized, and I think it would be well for it to come back to the place of its nativity. We have a pretty good country at Lancaster, and we should try to treat the

Association well. I therefore cordially extend this invitation, and hope that either the Association or the Executive Committee will see its way clear to accept it.

MR. FARRAND.—I move that the thanks of the Association should be extended to President Stahr for his invitation, and that the matter be referred to the Executive Committee for its action.

This motion was carried.

MR. BIRDSALL.—I think this meeting would be unwilling to adjourn without the adoption, in a formal manner, of a resolution embodying what is in the heart of every one of us, namely, an expression of thanks to the authorities of the College of the City of New York for the kind hospitality that has made our meeting so comfortable, and has in many ways ministered to our convenience while we have been here. I move, sir, a formal vote of thanks to the authorities of the College of the City of New York.

This motion was carried.

THE PRESIDENT.—Is there any other business? If not, the Association stands adjourned.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION, 1906-1907.

President

President WOODROW WILSON, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Vice-Presidents

Headmaster WALTER R. MARSH, St. Paul's School, Garden City, L. I.

Dean WALTER F. WILLCOX, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.

President ROBERT ELLIS THOMPSON, Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

President THOMAS FELL, St. John's College, Annapolis, Md.

Principal HERSCHEL A. NORRIS, Friends' School, Wilmington, Del.

Secretary

Professor ARTHUR H. QUINN, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Treasurer

Professor JOHN B. KIEFFER, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

Executive Committee

President, Secretary and Treasurer, ex officio.

Principal WILLIAM W. BIRDSALL, High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. EDWARD J. GOODWIN, University of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y.

Dr. MARTIN G. BRUMBAUGH, Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia, Pa.

Director FRANCIS R. LANE, Tome Institute, Port Deposit, Md.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1907.

Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Convention of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, held under the auspices of the Higher Public Schools of Philadelphia, November 30th and December 1st, 1906:

Address of welcome by President Robert Ellis Thompson, Central High School, of Philadelphia.

Response by Principal William W. Birdsall, Philadelphia High School for Girls, President of the Association.

The Compensation of College Teachers: President James D. Moffatt, Washington and Jefferson College; Prof. Jefferson B. Fletcher, Columbia University; Prof. Edward Everett Hale, Jr., Union University.

Discussion: Prof. W. A. Lamberton, University of Pennsylvania; President Thomas Fell, St. John's College.

The Secondary School and the College. (*a*) Should College Entrance Requirements be Reduced in Quantity? Principal John G. Wight, Wadleigh High School. (*b*) The Encroachments of the Secondary Schools on the College Curriculum: Professor Lucy M. Salmon, Vassar College.

Discussion: Headmaster Wilson Farrand, Newark Academy, Newark, N. J.; Dr. Edward H. Magill, New York City; Headmaster Louis L. Hooper, The Washington School; Principal Julius Sachs, Teachers' College; Professor Charles W. Hodell, Woman's College of Baltimore; Mrs. Mary Nichols Cox, Chappaqua Mountain Institute; Rev. Thompson H. Landon, Bordentown Military Institute; Mr. William N. Marcy, The Mackenzie School; Miss Amy Rayson, The Misses Rayson's School; Prof. Arthur E. Meaker, Lehigh University; Principal William A. Wetzel, High School, Trenton, N. J.; Principal Charles D. Larkins, Brooklyn Manual Training High School; Prof. Charles de Garmo, Cornell University; Principal Virgil Prettymann, Horace Mann School; Principal Francis A. Soper, Baltimore City College; Headmaster Wilson Farrand, Newark Academy.

President's Address, What is Preparation for College? President William W. Birdsall.

The Responsibility of the College for the Moral Conduct of the Student: President John H. Harris, Bucknell University; President James M. Taylor, Vassar College; Principal John H. Denbigh, Morris High School.

Discussion: Rev. Thompson H. Landon, Bordentown Military Institute; Mr. George Pearce Dymond, Hoe Grammar School, Plymouth, England; Professor Arthur E. Meaker, Lehigh University; Mr. William N. Marcy, The Mackenzie School; Principal J. G. Croswell, Brearley School.

LIST OF MEMBERS, 1907-8

LOCATION.	INSTITUTION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Albany, N. Y.	St. Agnes School	Catharine Regina Seabury.
Albany, N. Y.	Univ. of the State of N. Y.	Andrew S. Draper, LL.D.
Alfred, N. Y.	Alfred University	Boothe C. Davis, Ph.D.
Allegheny, Pa.	Allegheny Preparatory School.	Wilmot R. Jones.
Allegheny, Pa.	Western University of Pa.	John A. Brashear, D.Sc., LL.D.
Allentown, Pa.	Muhlenberg College	Rev. John A. W. Haas, D.D.
Annandale, N. Y.	St. Stephen's College	Rev. Thomas R. Harris, D.D.
Annapolis, Md.	St. John's College	Thomas Fell, LL.D.
Annville, Pa.	Lebanon Valley College	Rev. A. P. Funkhouser.
Asbury Park, N. J.	Asbury Park High School	Frederick S. Shepherd, Ph.D.
Aurora, N. Y.	Wells College	Rev. Geo. Morgan Ward, D.D.
Baltimore, Md. (625 St. Paul St.)	Arundell School for Girls	Elizabeth Maxwell Carroll.
Baltimore, Md.	Baltimore City College	Francis A. Soper.
Baltimore, Md. (311 Courtland St.)	Baltimore Polytechnic Institute	William R. King, U.S.N.
Baltimore, Md. (Cathedral and Preston Sts.)	Bryn Mawr School	Edith Hamilton.
Baltimore, Md.	(The) Country School	S. Wardwell Kinney.
Baltimore, Md.	Eastern High School	Robert H. Wright.
Baltimore, Md.	Friends' School	E. C. Wilson.
Baltimore, Md. (24th and St. Paul's Sts.)	Girls' Latin School	Leonard A. Blue.
Baltimore, Md.	Johns Hopkins University	Ira Remsen, LL.D.
Baltimore, Md.	Maryland State Normal School	George Washington Ward, Ph.D.
Baltimore, Md.	Western High School	David E. Weglein.
Baltimore, Md.	Woman's College	John Franklin Goucher, LL.D.
Bayonne, N. J.	Bayonne City High School	P. H. Smith.
Beaver, Pa.	Beaver College	Rev. Arthur Staples.
Bethlehem, Pa.	Bethlehem Preparatory School.	H. A. Foering.
Bethlehem, Pa.	Moravian Parochial School	Albert G. Rau.
Bethlehem, Pa.	Moravian Seminary	J. Max Hark, D.D.
Birmingham, Pa.	Birmingham School for Girls.	Miss N. J. Davis. James G. Miller.
Blairstown, N. J.	Blair Academy	John C. Sharpe.
Blairsville, Pa.	Blairsville College	Rev. N. D. Fiscus.
Bordentown, N. J.	Bordentown Military Inst.	Rev. Thompson H. Landon, D.D.
Brooklyn, N. Y. (Clifton Pl., St. James Pl. and Lafayette Av.)	Adelphi College	Charles H. Levermore, Ph.D.
Brooklyn, N. Y. (185 Lincoln Pl.)	Berkeley Institute	Julian W. Abernethy, Ph.D.
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Boys' High School	James Sullivan, Ph.D.
Brooklyn, N. Y. (Drigg's Av. and S. 3d St.)	Eastern District High School.	William T. Vlymen, Ph.D.
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Erasmus Hall High School	W. B. Gunnison.
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Girls' High School	W. L. Felter, Ph.D.
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Manual Training High School	Charles D. Larkins.
Brooklyn, N. Y.	Packer Institute	Truman J. Backus, LL.D.
Brooklyn, N. Y. (99 Livingston St.)	Polytechnic Prep. School	Alvan E. Duerr.
Bryn Mawr, Pa.	Bryn Mawr College	Miss M. Carey Thomas, Ph.D., LL.D.
Bryn Mawr, Pa.	The Baldwin School	Jane C. Brownell.
Buffalo, N. Y.	Canisius College	Rev. Augustine A. Miller, S.J.

LOCATION.	INSTITUTION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Burlington, N. J....	St. Mary's Hall.....	John Fearnley.
Canton, N. Y.....	St. Lawrence University.....	Rev. Almon Gunnison, D.D., LL.D.
Carlisle, Pa.....	Dickinson College.....	George Edward Reed, D.D., LL.D.
Chambersburg, Pa...	Penn Hall.....	Magnus C. Ihlseng, Ph.D.
Chambersburg, Pa...	Wilson College.....	M. H. Reaser, Ph.D.
Chester, Pa.....	Chester High School.....	Joseph G. Smedley.
Chestertown, Md....	Washington College.....	James W. Cain, LL.D.
Chestnut Hill, Pa...	Chestnut Hill Academy.....	James L. Patterson.
Clinton, N. Y.....	Hamilton College.....	M. Woolsey Stryker, D.D., LL.D.
Collegeville, Pa.....	Ursinus College.....	George L. Omwake, Dean.
Columbia, Pa.....	Columbia High School.....	Mary Y. Welsh.
Dobbs Ferry, N. Y..	The Mackenzie School.....	Rev. James C. Mackenzie, Ph.D.
East Orange, N. J...	East Orange High School....	Charles W. Evans.
Easton, Pa.....	Easton High School.....	William A. Jones.
Easton, Pa.....	Lafayette College.....	Ethelbert D. Warfield, LL.D.
Elizabeth, N. J.....	Pingry School.....	S. Archibald Smith.
Frederick, Md.....	Woman's College.....	Joseph H. Apple.
Garden City, L. I....	St. Paul's School.....	Walter R. Marsh.
Geneva, N. Y.....	Hobart College.....	Rev. Langdon C. Stewardson, LL.D.
George School, Pa...	George School.....	J. S. Walton, Ph.D.
Georgetown, D. C...	Georgetown College.....	Rev. David H. Buell, S.J.
Greenwich, Conn....	Misses Ely's School.....	Elizabeth L. Ely.
Hagerstown, Md.....	Kee Mar College.....	J. Emory Shaw.
Hamilton, N. Y.....	Colgate Academy.....	Frank L. Shephardson.
Hamilton, N. Y.....	Colgate University.....	George E. Merrill, D.D., LL.D.
Haverford, Pa.....	Haverford College.....	Isaac Sharpless, D.Sc., LL.D.
Haverford, Pa.....	Haverford School.....	Charles S. Crossman.
Hightstown, N. J....	Peddie Institute.....	Roger W. Swetland.
Ithaca, N. Y.....	Cornell University.....	J. G. Schurman, LL.D.
Kingston, Pa.....	Wyoming Seminary.....	Rev. L. L. Sprague, D.D.
Lancaster, Pa.....	Franklin and Marshall Acad..	E. M. Hartman.
Lancaster, Pa.....	Franklin and Marshall College	John S. Stahr, Ph.D., D.D
Lancaster, Pa.....	Miss Stahr's School.....	Alice H. Byrne.
Lancaster, Pa.....	Yeates School.....	Rev. Frederick Gardiner.
Lansdowne, Pa.....	Lansdowne High School.....	Walter L. Philips.
Lawrenceville, N. J..	Lawrenceville School.....	S. J. McPherson, Ph.D.
Lewisburg, Pa.....	Bucknell University.....	John H. Harris, D.D.
Lititz, Pa.....	Linden Hall Seminary.....	Rev. Charles D. Kreider.
McDonogh, Md.....	McDonogh School.....	Sidney T. Moreland.
Meadville, Pa.....	Allegheny College.....	William H. Crawford, D.D.
Mercersburg, Pa.....	Mercersburg Academy.....	William Mann Irvine, Ph.D.
Mohegan, N. Y.....	Mohegan Lake School.....	Henry Waters. Albert E. Linder.
Montclair, N. J.....	Montclair Military Academy..	John G. Mac Vicar.
Montclair, N. J.....	Montclair Public High School.	Randall Spaulding.
Morristown, N. J....	Morristown School.....	Francis C. Woodman.
Myerstown, Pa.....	Albright College.....	James D. Woodring, D.D.
New Brighton, N. Y.	Staten Island Academy.....	Frederick E. Partington.
New Brunswick, N. J.	Rutgers College.....	W. H. S. Demarest, D.D.
New Brunswick, N. J.	Rutgers Preparatory Academy	Eliot R. Payson, Ph.D.
New York City (72 St. Nicholas Av.).	Barnard School for Boys.....	Wm. Livingston Hazen.
New York City (17 W. 44th St.).....	Brearley School.....	J. G. Croswell.
New York City.....	College of the City of New York	John H. Finley, LL.D.
New York City (30 W. 16th St.).....	College of St. Francis Xavier.	Rev. D. W. Hearn, S.J.
New York City (241 W. 77th St.).....	Collegiate School.....	L. C. Mygatt, L.H.D.
New York City (34 and 36 E. 51st St.).	Columbia Grammar School...	Benajmin Howell Campbell.

LOCATION.	INSTITUTION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
New York City	Columbia University	Nicholas Murray Butler, LL.D.
New York City (20 E. 50th St.)	Cutler School	A. H. Cutler, B.A., Ph.D.
New York City (39th St. and 8th Ave.)	De Witt Clinton High School.	John T. Buchanan.
New York City (226 E. 16th St.)	Friends' Seminary	Edward B. Rawson.
New York City	Horace Mann High School	Virgil Prettyman, Ph.D.
New York City (35 W. 84th St.)	Irving School	Louis Dwight Ray, Ph.D.
New York City (65 E. 83d St.)	Loyola School	Rev. N. N. McKinnon, S.J.
New York City (Grand Boulevard and 131st St.)	Manhattan College	Brother Jerome.
New York City (164 W. 75th St.)	Misses Rayson's School	Amy Rayson.
New York City (Boston Road and 166th St.)	Morris High School	John H. Denbigh.
New York City (Park Av. and 68th St.)	Normal College	J. A. Gillet.
New York City	New York University	Henry M. MacCracken, D.D., LL.D.
New York City (38 W. 59th St.)	Sachs' Collegiate Institute	Otto Koenig, J.U.D.
New York City (114th St. and 7th Av.)	Wadleigh High School	John G. Wight, Ph.D.
Newark, Del.	Delaware College	George A. Harter, Ph.D.
Newark, N. J.	Newark Academy	Wilson Farrand.
Newark, N. J.	Newark Public High School	W. E. Stearns.
Ocean Grove, N. J.	Neptune Township High School	L. A. Doren.
Orange, N. J.	Dearborn-Morgan School	David A. Kennedy, Ph.D. Mrs. Abby B. Morgan.
Ossining, N. Y.	Dr. Holbrook's School	Dwight Holbrook, Ph.D.
Ossining, N. Y.	Mt. Pleasant Academy	C. F. Brusie.
Paterson, N. J.	Paterson High School	J. A. Reinhart.
Pennsburg, Pa.	Perkiomen Seminary	Rev. O. S. Kriebel.
Philadelphia (2011 De Lancey Pl.)	(The) Agnes Irwin School	Sophy Dallas Irwin.
Philadelphia (Broad and Green Sts.)	Central High School	Robert Ellis Thompson, Ph.D., D.D.
Philadelphia (17th and Wood Sts.)	Central Manual Training High School	William L. Sayre, Sc.D.
Philadelphia, Pa.	Episcopal Academy	William H. Klapp, M.D.
Philadelphia (15th and Race Sts.)	Friends' Central High School.	Boys' Dep't., J. Eugene Baker. Girls' Dep't., Anna W. Speakman.
Philadelphia (Gtn.)	Germantown Academy	William Kershaw, Ph.D.
Philadelphia (140 N. 16th St.)	Friends' Select School	J. Henry Bartlett.
Philadelphia (Coulter St., Gtn.)	Germantown Friends' School	Stanley R. Yarnall.
Philadelphia (Broad and Green Sts.)	Girls' Commercial High School	Emily L. Graham.
Philadelphia (17th and Spring Garden Sts.)	High School for Girls	W. W. Birdsall.
Philadelphia (2209 Walnut St.)	Holman School for Girls	Adèle B. Ebbinghausen.

LOCATION.	INSTITUTION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Philadelphia, Pa.	Northeast Manual Training High School	Andrew J. Morrison, Ph.D.
Philadelphia (1720 Arch St.)	Philadelphia Collegiate Institute for Girls	Susan C. Lodge.
Philadelphia (1301 Spring Garden St.)	Philadelphia Normal School for Girls	J. Monroe Willard.
Philadelphia, Pa.	Temple College	Rev. R. H. Conwell.
Philadelphia, Pa.	University of Pennsylvania	Charles C. Harrison, LL.D.
Pittsburgh, Pa. (4721 Fifth Ave.)	Miss Stuart's School	Ella Gordon Stuart.
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Central High School	Edward Rynearson.
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Shady Side Academy	W. R. Crabbe, Ph.D.
Pittsburgh, Pa. (Shady Av.)	Thurston Preparatory School	Alice M. Thurston.
Plainfield, N. J.	Plainfield High School	I. W. Travell.
Port Deposit, Md.	Tome Institute	Francis Ransom Lane.
Pottstown, Pa.	Hill School	John Meigs, Ph.D.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	Riverview Academy	J. B. Bisbee.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	Vassar College	James M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D.
Princeton, N. J.	Princeton University	Woodrow Wilson, LL.D.
Reading, Pa.	Boys' High School	Robert S. Birch.
Redbank, N. J.	High School	S. V. Arrowsmith.
Rochester, N. Y.	University of Rochester	Rush Rhees, LL.D.
Rye, N. Y.	Rye Seminary	Mrs. Life and the Misses Stowe.
Schenectady, N. Y.	Union College	B. H. Ripton, Dean.
S. Bethlehem, Pa.	Lehigh University	Henry S. Drinker, LL.D.
State College, Pa.	Pennsylvania State College	Judson P. Welsh, Ph.D.
Summit, N. J.	Kent Place School	Mrs. Sarah Woodman Paul.
Swarthmore, Pa.	Swarthmore College	Joseph Swain, LL.D.
Swarthmore, Pa.	Swarthmore Prep. School	Arthur H. Tomlinson.
Syracuse, N. Y.	Syracuse University	Rev. Jas. Roscoe Day, S.T.D., LL.D.
Trenton, N. J.	Rand Collegiate School	Edwin W. Rand.
Trenton, N. J.	State Model School	James M. Green, Ph.D.
Troy, N. Y.	Emma Willard School	Anna Leach.
Utica, N. Y.	The Balliol School	Mrs. Louise Sheffield Brownell Saunders. Edith Rockwell Hall.
Warren, Pa.	Warren High School	W. L. MacGowan.
Washington, D. C.	George Washington University	Charles W. Needham, D.D., LL.D.
Washington, D. C.	Friends' School	Thomas W. Sidwell.
Washington, D. C.	Gallaudet College	Edw. Minor Gallaudet, LL.D.
Washington, D. C.	Howard University	Rev. Wilbur P. Thrikield, D.D., LL.D.
Washington, D. C. (Wisconsin Av.)	The Washington School for Boys	Louis L. Hooper.
Washington, Pa.	Washington and Jefferson Academy	James N. Rule.
Washington, Pa.	Washington and Jefferson College	James D. Moffatt, D.D.
Wayne, Pa.	St. Luke's School	Charles Henry Strout.
Waynesburg, Pa.	Waynesburg College	A. F. Lewis.
West Chester, Pa.	State Normal School	G. M. Phillips, Ph.D.
West Chester, Pa.	West Chester High School	Addison L. Jones.
Westminster, Md.	Western Maryland College	Rev. Thomas Hamilton Lewis, D.D.
Westtown, Pa.	Westtown Boarding School	William F. Wickersham.
Wilmington, Del.	Friends' School	Herschel A. Norris.
Wilmington, Del.	High School	A. H. Berlin.
Yonkers, N. Y.	Halsted School	Mary S. Jenkins.
Yonkers, N. Y.	Yonkers High School	William A. Edwards.
York, Pa.	Collegiate Institute	Rev. E. T. Jeffers, D.D., LL.D.

DELEGATES REGISTERED, 1907.

ALBRIGHT COLLEGE, *Myerstown, Pa.* Clellan A. Bowman.

ALFRED UNIVERSITY, *Alfred, N. Y.* Boothe Colwell Davis.

ASBURY PARK HIGH SCHOOL, *Asbury Park, N. J.* Carl Brands, Eva E. Briggs, Fred S. Shepherd, Principal; Samuel D. Thompson.

BALLIOL SCHOOL, *Utica, N. Y.* Alice S. Butler, Edith Rockwell Hall, Principal.

BERKELEY INSTITUTE, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* J. W. Abernethy, Principal; Francis A. Smith.

BETHLEHEM PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *Bethlehem, Pa.* Thomas K. Smith.

BIRMINGHAM SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Birmingham, Pa.* Catherine Allen.

BORDENTOWN MILITARY INSTITUTE, *Bordentown, N. J.* S. W. Landon, Headmaster.

BOYS' HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Edwin Fairley, Theodore C. Mitchell, Emberson E. Proper, Ernest Riess, James Sullivan, Principal.

BREARLEY SCHOOL, *New York City.* James G. Croswell, Headmaster.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, *Lewisburg, Pa.* Thomas A. Edwards, John H. Harris, President.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* S. E. Berger, Francis Burke Brandt, John Louis Haney, Chessman A. Herrick, Francis H. Lee, William Hughes Mearns, Howard W. Nudd, Nathan Roberts, J. T. Rorer, E. A. Schnabel, George Alvin Snook.

CENTRAL MANUAL TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* John T. Brackin, Edward A. Partridge, William L. Sayre, Principal.

CHESTNUT HILL ACADEMY, *Chestnut Hill, Pa.* J. L. Patterson, Headmaster.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY, *Hamilton, N. Y.* Newton Lloyd Andrews, W. H. Crawshaw, Dean.

COLLEGIATE SCHOOL, *New York City.* Frank S. Morse, L. C. Mygatt, Principal.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, *New York City.* Joseph Allen, Barclay W. Bradley, Philip P. Brant, Edmund Burke, Walter E. Clark, Alfred G. Compton, Mario E. Cosenza, L. W. Crawford, George A. Daly, Louis Delomarre, R. B. MacDougall, Stephen P. Duggan, Mrs. George V. Edwards, George V. Edwards, V. Fuentes, Howard C. Glenn, W. B. Guthrie, Samuel B. Heckman, P. T. Kammerer, Carl W. Kinkeldey, David Klein, George Lamouret, Emory B. Lease, H. N. S. Lowther, George W. McClelland, Thomas R. Moore, Homer C. Newton, Engelbert Neus, Frederick M. Pedersen, Frederick G. Reynolds, George G. Scott, John R. Sim, Fitzgerald Tesdall, C. A. Toursauit, A. B. Turner, Joseph L. Tyman, Adolph Wemer, E. E. Whitford.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, *New York City.* Charles H. Elliott, Frederick A. Goetze, W. Addison Hervey, Ida M. Hollis, Gonzalez Lodge, Fannie P. Mathes, Nelson G. McCrea, Henry B. Mitchell, Julius Sachs.

COMMERCIAL HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* H. Nesbit Buddin, Esther V. Davis, Luise C. Ehlers, Elizabeth B. Janney, Maude B. Hansche, Agnes H. Long, Emma J. Longstreth.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, *Utica, N. Y.* H. W. Humble.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, *Hanover, N. H.* John K. Lord.

DEARBORN-MORGAN SCHOOL, *Orange, N. J.* David A. Kennedy.

DELAWARE COLLEGE, *Newark, Delaware.* George A. Harter, President.

DEWITT CLINTON HIGH SCHOOL, *Yonkers, N. Y.* T. Montester.

EASTERN DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Charles E. Dixon, David H. Holmes, Anna L. Phillips, Aline C. Stratford, William T. Vlymen, Principal.

EASTERN HIGH SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* Laura V. DeValin, Harriett E. Ebaugh, Katherine M. Lewis, Robert Wright, Principal.

EASTON HIGH SCHOOL, *Easton, Pa.* E. C. Lavers, J. H. Lindenmann.

ERASMUS HALL HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* W. B. Gunnison, Principal; Sidney S. Stacey, Kate E. Turner.

ESSEX COUNTY SCHOOLS, *New Jersey.* A. B. Meredith, Superintendent.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL ACADEMY, *Lancaster, Pa.* T. G. Helm, M. W. Witmer.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, *Lancaster, Pa.* A. T. G. Apple, John B. Kieffer, John S. Stahr, President.

FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* Edward C. Wilson, Principal.

FRIENDS' CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* J. Eugene Baker.

FRIENDS' SELECT SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* John B. Dillingham, J. Henry Bartlett, Principal; Jane W. Bartlett.

FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Wilmington, Del.* Herschel A. Norris, Floyd P. Johnson

GERMANTOWN FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Elizabeth T. Roberts, E. M. Wistar, Stanley R. Yarnall, Principal.

GEORGE SCHOOL, *Pennsylvania.* Joseph S. Walton, Principal; Mrs. Joseph S. Walton, J. Barnard Walton.

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, *Washington, D. C.* H. L. Hodgkins, Dean.

GIRLS' HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* William L. Felter, Principal; Charlotte Smith.

HALSTED SCHOOL, *Yonkers, N. Y.* Mary Sicard Jenkins, Principal; Helen A. Cobb, Clara Bohm.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE, *Haverford, Pa.* Isaac Sharpless, President.

HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Edith B. Albright, Jessie E. Allen, William W. Birdsall, Principal; Amelia C. Blight, Anna M. Breadin, Emma H. Carroll, Margaret H. Coyle, Ada B. Curtis, Anne Farson, L. H. Haeseler, Ada V. Hubbs, Alice M. Hutchings, Ida A. Keller, Eleanor L. McKenna, Sarah P. Miller, Elmira Lodor, Katherine E. Puncheon, Margaret Sproul, Emma L. G. Thomas, Margaret S. Prichard.

HOBART COLLEGE, *Geneva, N. Y.* John Archer Silver, Langdon C. Stewardson, President.

HOLBROOK SCHOOL, *Ossining, N. Y.* Dwight Holbrook.

HOLMAN SCHOOL, *2204 Walnut Street, Philadelphia.* Harriett M. Brownell.

HORACE MANN HIGH SCHOOL, *New York City.* C. M. Baker, C. E. Bikle, Edward E. Hanch, Alexander J. Inglis, Virgil Prettyman, Principal.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY, *Washington, D. C.* Wilbur P. Thirkield.

JACOB TOME INSTITUTE, *Port Deposit, Md.* Thomas S. Baker.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, *Baltimore, Md.* Edward H. Griffin, Dean.

KENT PLACE SCHOOL, *Summit, N. J.* Mrs. Sarah W. Paul, Principal; Miss A. S. Woodman.

LANSDOWNE HIGH SCHOOL, *Lansdowne, Pa.* Walter L. Phillips, Principal.

LAWRENCEVILLE SCHOOL, *Lawrenceville, N. J.* Fletcher Durell.

LINDEN HALL SEMINARY, *Lititz, Pa.* Josephine F. Ancona, Charles D. Kreider, Mrs. Charles D. Kreider.

LOYOLA SCHOOL, *New York City.* Rev. Francis A. Breen, S.J.; Rev. W. Coleman Nevils, S.J.

MACKENZIE SCHOOL, *Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.* James C. Mackenzie, Director; William N. Marcy, Wyatt W. Randall, Frank P. R. VanSyckel.

MANHATTAN COLLEGE, *New York City.* Brother Adjutor, Brother Berthald, Brother Anthony Byrne, Brother Chrysostom.

MANUAL TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Sarah E. Bawden, Albert J. V. Kern, Charles D. Larkins, Principal.

MCKINLEY MANUAL TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* George E. Myers, Principal.

MERCERSBURG ACADEMY, *Mercersburg, Pa.* James G. Miller.

MONTCLAIR ACADEMY, *Montclair, N. J.* C. Frank Phipps.

MONTCLAIR HIGH SCHOOL, *Montclair, N. J.* Mary Alinda Lathrop, Randall Spaulding, Principal; H. J. Turner.

MORAVIAN PAROCHIAL SCHOOL, *Bethlehem, Pa.* Albert G. Rau, Principal.

MORRIS HIGH SCHOOL, *New York City.* G. S. Blakely, James E. Peabody, A. Everett Peterson, Frederick C. White.

MORRISTOWN SCHOOL, *Morristown, N. J.* Francis C. Woodman, Headmaster.

NEWARK ACADEMY, *Newark, N. J.* Samuel A. Farrand, Headmaster; Wilson Farrand, Headmaster; Emery W. Given, M. I. Snyder.

NEWARK HIGH SCHOOL, *Newark, N. J.* Katherine F. Belcher, M. Buttuer, H. L. Fassett, P. Nichlas, W. C. Sandy.

NEW ROCHELLE SCHOOLS, *New York.* Albert Leonard, Superintendent.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY, *New York City.* Henry M. MacCracken, Chancellor; John H. MacCracken, E. G. Sihler.

NORMAL COLLEGE, *New York City.* Edward S. Burgess, Claudine Gray, C. F. Kayser, Lena G. Norton, G. M. Whicher.

PATERSON HIGH SCHOOL, *Paterson, N. J.* Mellinger E. Henry, J. A. Reinhart, Principal.

ENN HALL, *Chambersburg, Pa.* M. C. Ihlseng, Principal.

ITTSBURGH HIGH SCHOOL, *Pittsburgh, Pa.* Edward Rynearson, Director.

LYTECHNIC PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Alvan E. Duerr, Headmaster; Erwin S. Spink.

NCETON UNIVERSITY, *Princeton, N. J.* N. E. Griffin.

ELSVILLE ACADEMY, *Riegelsville, Pa.* Glen C. Heller, Principal.

RVIEW ACADEMY, *Poughkeepsie, N. Y.* Josiah Bartlett.

ERS COLLEGE, *New Brunswick, N. J.* Louis Bouvier.

S COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, *New York City.* Edward B. Chamberlain, to Koenig, Principal.

SIDE ACADEMY, *Pittsburgh, Pa.* W. R. Crabbe, Principal; F. W. re.

LOCATION.	INSTITUTION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Philadelphia, Pa.	Northeast Manual Training High School	Andrew J. Morrison, Ph.D.
Philadelphia (1720 Arch St.)	Philadelphia Collegiate Institute for Girls	Susan C. Lodge.
Philadelphia (1301 Spring Garden St.)	Philadelphia Normal School for Girls	J. Monroe Willard.
Philadelphia, Pa.	Temple College	Rev. R. H. Conwell.
Philadelphia, Pa.	University of Pennsylvania	Charles C. Harrison, LL.D.
Pittsburgh, Pa. (4721 Fifth Ave.)	Miss Stuart's School	Ella Gordon Stuart.
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Central High School	Edward Rynearson.
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Shady Side Academy	W. R. Crabbe, Ph.D.
Pittsburgh, Pa. (Shady Av.)	Thurston Preparatory School	Alice M. Thurston.
Plainfield, N. J.	Plainfield High School	I. W. Travell.
Port Deposit, Md.	Tome Institute	Francis Ransom Lane.
Pottstown, Pa.	Hill School	John Meigs, Ph.D.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	Riverview Academy	J. B. Bisbee.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	Vassar College	James M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D.
Princeton, N. J.	Princeton University	Woodrow Wilson, LL.D.
Reading, Pa.	Boys' High School	Robert S. Birch.
Redbank, N. J.	High School	S. V. Arrowsmith.
Rochester, N. Y.	University of Rochester	Rush Rhees, LL.D.
Rye, N. Y.	Rye Seminary	Mrs. Life and the Misses Stowe.
Schenectady, N. Y.	Union College	B. H. Ripton, Dean.
S. Bethlehem, Pa.	Lehigh University	Henry S. Drinker, LL.D.
State College, Pa.	Pennsylvania State College	Judson P. Welsh, Ph.D.
Summit, N. J.	Kent Place School	Mrs. Sarah Woodman Paul.
Swarthmore, Pa.	Swarthmore College	Joseph Swain, LL.D.
Swarthmore, Pa.	Swarthmore Prep. School	Arthur H. Tomlinson.
Syracuse, N. Y.	Syracuse University	Rev. Jas. Roscoe Day, S.T.D., LL.D.
Trenton, N. J.	Rand Collegiate School	Edwin W. Rand.
Trenton, N. J.	State Model School	James M. Green, Ph.D.
Troy, N. Y.	Emma Willard School	Anna Leach.
Utica, N. Y.	The Balliol School	Mrs. Louise Sheffield Brownell Saunders. Edith Rockwell Hall.
Warren, Pa.	Warren High School	W. L. MacGowan.
Washington, D. C.	George Washington University	Charles W. Needham, D.D., LL.D.
Washington, D. C.	Friends' School	Thomas W. Sidwell.
Washington, D. C.	Gallaudet College	Edw. Minor Gallaudet, LL.D.
Washington, D. C.	Howard University	Rev. Wilbur P. Thrikield, D.D., LL.D.
Washington, D. C. (Wisconsin Av.)	The Washington School for Boys	Louis L. Hooper.
Washington, Pa.	Washington and Jefferson Academy	James N. Rule.
Washington, Pa.	Washington and Jefferson College	James D. Moffatt, D.D.
Wayne, Pa.	St. Luke's School	Charles Henry Strout.
Waynesburg, Pa.	Waynesburg College	A. F. Lewis.
West Chester, Pa.	State Normal School	G. M. Phillips, Ph.D.
West Chester, Pa.	West Chester High School	Addison L. Jones.
Westminster, Md.	Western Maryland College	Rev. Thomas Hamilton Lewis, D.D.
Westtown, Pa.	Westtown Boarding School	William F. Wickersham.
Wilmington, Del.	Friends' School	Herschel A. Norris.
Wilmington, Del.	High School	A. H. Berlin.
Yonkers, N. Y.	Halsted School	Mary S. Jenkins.
Yonkers, N. Y.	Yonkers High School	William A. Edwards.
York, Pa.	Collegiate Institute	Rev. E. T. Jeffers, D.D., LL.D.

DELEGATES REGISTERED, 1907.

ALBRIGHT COLLEGE, *Myerstown, Pa.* Clellan A. Bowman.

ALFRED UNIVERSITY, *Alfred, N. Y.* Boothe Colwell Davis.

ASBURY PARK HIGH SCHOOL, *Asbury Park, N. J.* Carl Brands, Eva E. Briggs, Fred S. Shepherd, Principal; Samuel D. Thompson.

BALLIOL SCHOOL, *Utica, N. Y.* Alice S. Butler, Edith Rockwell Hall, Principal.

BERKELEY INSTITUTE, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* J. W. Abernethy, Principal; Francis A. Smith.

BETHLEHEM PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *Bethlehem, Pa.* Thomas K. Smith.

BIRMINGHAM SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Birmingham, Pa.* Catherine Allen.

BORDENTOWN MILITARY INSTITUTE, *Bordentown, N. J.* S. W. Landon, Headmaster.

BOYS' HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Edwin Fairley, Theodore C. Mitchell, Emberson E. Proper, Ernest Riess, James Sullivan, Principal.

BREARLEY SCHOOL, *New York City.* James G. Croswell, Headmaster.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, *Lewisburg, Pa.* Thomas A. Edwards, John H. Harris, President.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* S. E. Berger, Francis Burke Brandt, John Louis Haney, Chessman A. Herrick, Francis H. Lee, William Hughes Mearns, Howard W. Nudd, Nathan Roberts, J. T. Rorer, E. A. Schnabel, George Alvin Snook.

CENTRAL MANUAL TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* John T. Brackin, Edward A. Partridge, William L. Sayre, Principal.

CHESTNUT HILL ACADEMY, *Chestnut Hill, Pa.* J. L. Patterson, Headmaster.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY, *Hamilton, N. Y.* Newton Lloyd Andrews, W. H. Crawshaw, Dean.

COLLEGIATE SCHOOL, *New York City.* Frank S. Morse, L. C. Mygatt, Principal.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, *New York City.* Joseph Allen, Barclay W. Bradley, Philip P. Brant, Edmund Burke, Walter E. Clark, Alfred G. Compton, Mario E. Cosenza, L. W. Crawford, George A. Daly, Louis Delomarre, R. B. MacDougall, Stephen P. Duggan, Mrs. George V. Edwards, George V. Edwards, V. Fuentes, Howard C. Glenn, W. B. Guthrie, Samuel B. Heckman, P. T. Kammerer, Carl W. Kinkeldey, David Klein, George Lamouret, Emory B. Lease, H. N. S. Lowther, George W. McClelland, Thomas R. Moore, Homer C. Newton, Engelbert Neus, Frederick M. Pedersen, Frederick G. Reynolds, George G. Scott, John R. Sim, Fitzgerald Tesdall, C. A. Toursauit, A. B. Turner, Joseph L. Tyman, Adolph Wemer, E. E. Whitford.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, *New York City.* Charles H. Elliott, Frederick A. Goetze, W. Addison Hervey, Ida M. Hollis, Gonzalez Lodge, Fannie P. Mathes, Nelson G. McCrea, Henry B. Mitchell, Julius Sachs.

COMMERCIAL HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* H. Nesbit Buddin, Esther V. Davis, Luise C. Ehlers, Elizabeth B. Janney, Maude B. Hansche, Agnes H. Long, Emma J. Longstreth.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, *Utica, N. Y.* H. W. Humble.

LOCATION.	INSTITUTION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Philadelphia, Pa.	Northeast Manual Training High School	Andrew J. Morrison, Ph.D.
Philadelphia (1720 Arch St.)	Philadelphia Collegiate Institute for Girls	Susan C. Lodge.
Philadelphia (1301 Spring Garden St.)	Philadelphia Normal School for Girls	J. Monroe Willard.
Philadelphia, Pa.	Temple College	Rev. R. H. Conwell.
Philadelphia, Pa.	University of Pennsylvania	Charles C. Harrison, LL.D.
Pittsburgh, Pa. (4721 Fifth Ave.)	Miss Stuart's School	Ella Gordon Stuart.
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Central High School	Edward Rynearson.
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Shady Side Academy	W. R. Crabbe, Ph.D.
Pittsburgh, Pa. (Shady Av.)	Thurston Preparatory School	Alice M. Thurston.
Plainfield, N. J.	Plainfield High School	I. W. Travell.
Port Deposit, Md.	Tome Institute	Francis Ransom Lane.
Pottstown, Pa.	Hill School	John Meigs, Ph.D.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	Riverview Academy	J. B. Bisbee.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	Vassar College	James M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D.
Princeton, N. J.	Princeton University	Woodrow Wilson, LL.D.
Reading, Pa.	Boys' High School	Robert S. Birch.
Redbank, N. J.	High School	S. V. Arrowsmith.
Rochester, N. Y.	University of Rochester	Rush Rhees, LL.D.
Rye, N. Y.	Rye Seminary	Mrs. Life and the Misses Stowe.
Schenectady, N. Y.	Union College	B. H. Ripton, Dean.
S. Bethlehem, Pa.	Lehigh University	Henry S. Drinker, LL.D.
State College, Pa.	Pennsylvania State College	Judson P. Welsh, Ph.D.
Summit, N. J.	Kent Place School	Mrs. Sarah Woodman Paul.
Swarthmore, Pa.	Swarthmore College	Joseph Swain, LL.D.
Swarthmore, Pa.	Swarthmore Prep. School	Arthur H. Tomlinson.
Syracuse, N. Y.	Syracuse University	Rev. Jas. Roscoe Day, S.T.D., LL.D.
Trenton, N. J.	Rand Collegiate School	Edwin W. Rand.
Trenton, N. J.	State Model School	James M. Green, Ph.D.
Troy, N. Y.	Emma Willard School	Anna Leach.
Utica, N. Y.	The Balliol School	Mrs. Louise Sheffield Brownell Saunders. Edith Rockwell Hall.
Warren, Pa.	Warren High School	W. L. MacGowan.
Washington, D. C.	George Washington University	Charles W. Needham, D.D., LL.D.
Washington, D. C.	Friends' School	Thomas W. Sidwell.
Washington, D. C.	Gallaudet College	Edw. Minor Gallaudet, LL.D.
Washington, D. C.	Howard University	Rev. Wilbur P. Thrikield, D.D., LL.D.
Washington, D. C. (Wisconsin Av.)	The Washington School for Boys	Louis L. Hooper.
Washington, Pa.	Washington and Jefferson Academy	James N. Rule.
Washington, Pa.	Washington and Jefferson College	James D. Moffatt, D.D.
Wayne, Pa.	St. Luke's School	Charles Henry Strout.
Waynesburg, Pa.	Waynesburg College	A. F. Lewis.
West Chester, Pa.	State Normal School	G. M. Phillips, Ph.D.
West Chester, Pa.	West Chester High School	Addison L. Jones.
Westminster, Md.	Western Maryland College	Rev. Thomas Hamilton Lewis, D.D.
Westtown, Pa.	Westtown Boarding School	William F. Wickersham.
Wilmington, Del.	Friends' School	Herschel A. Norris.
Wilmington, Del.	High School	A. H. Berlin.
Yonkers, N. Y.	Halsted School	Mary S. Jenkins.
Yonkers, N. Y.	Yonkers High School	William A. Edwards.
York, Pa.	Collegiate Institute	Rev. E. T. Jeffers, D.D., LL.D.

DELEGATES REGISTERED, 1907.

ALBRIGHT COLLEGE, *Myerstown, Pa.* Clellan A. Bowman.

ALFRED UNIVERSITY, *Alfred, N. Y.* Boothe Colwell Davis.

ASBURY PARK HIGH SCHOOL, *Asbury Park, N. J.* Carl Brands, Eva E. Briggs, Fred S. Shepherd, Principal; Samuel D. Thompson.

BALLIOL SCHOOL, *Utica, N. Y.* Alice S. Butler, Edith Rockwell Hall, Principal.

BERKELEY INSTITUTE, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* J. W. Abernethy, Principal; Francis A. Smith.

BETHLEHEM PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *Bethlehem, Pa.* Thomas K. Smith.

BIRMINGHAM SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Birmingham, Pa.* Catherine Allen.

BORDENTOWN MILITARY INSTITUTE, *Bordentown, N. J.* S. W. Landon, Headmaster.

BOYS' HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Edwin Fairley, Theodore C. Mitchell, Emberson E. Proper, Ernest Riess, James Sullivan, Principal.

BREARLEY SCHOOL, *New York City.* James G. Croswell, Headmaster.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, *Lewisburg, Pa.* Thomas A. Edwards, John H. Harris, President.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* S. E. Berger, Francis Burke Brandt, John Louis Haney, Chessman A. Herrick, Francis H. Lee, William Hughes Mearns, Howard W. Nudd, Nathan Roberts, J. T. Rorer, E. A. Schnabel, George Alvin Snook.

CENTRAL MANUAL TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* John T. Brackin, Edward A. Partridge, William L. Sayre, Principal.

CHESTNUT HILL ACADEMY, *Chestnut Hill, Pa.* J. L. Patterson, Headmaster.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY, *Hamilton, N. Y.* Newton Lloyd Andrews, W. H. Crawshaw, Dean.

COLLEGIATE SCHOOL, *New York City.* Frank S. Morse, L. C. Mygatt, Principal.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, *New York City.* Joseph Allen, Barclay W. Bradley, Philip P. Brant, Edmund Burke, Walter E. Clark, Alfred G. Compton, Mario E. Cosenza, L. W. Crawford, George A. Daly, Louis Delomarre, R. B. MacDougall, Stephen P. Duggan, Mrs. George V. Edwards, George V. Edwards, V. Fuentes, Howard C. Glenn, W. B. Guthrie, Samuel B. Heckman, P. T. Kammerer, Carl W. Kinkeldey, David Klein, George Lamouret, Emory B. Lease, H. N. S. Lowther, George W. McClelland, Thomas R. Moore, Homer C. Newton, Engelbert Neus, Frederick M. Pedersen, Frederick G. Reynolds, George G. Scott, John R. Sim, Fitzgerald Tesdall, C. A. Toursauit, A. B. Turner, Joseph L. Tyman, Adolph Wemer, E. E. Whitford.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, *New York City.* Charles H. Elliott, Frederick A. Goetze, W. Addison Hervey, Ida M. Hollis, Gonzalez Lodge, Fannie P. Mathes, Nelson G. McCrea, Henry B. Mitchell, Julius Sachs.

COMMERCIAL HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* H. Nesbit Buddin, Esther V. Davis, Luise C. Ehlers, Elizabeth B. Janney, Maude B. Hansche, Agnes H. Long, Emma J. Longstreth.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, *Utica, N. Y.* H. W. Humble.

LOCATION.	INSTITUTION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Philadelphia, Pa.	Northeast Manual Training High School	Andrew J. Morrison, Ph.D.
Philadelphia (1720 Arch St.)	Philadelphia Collegiate Institute for Girls	Susan C. Lodge.
Philadelphia (1301 Spring Garden St.)	Philadelphia Normal School for Girls	J. Monroe Willard.
Philadelphia, Pa.	Temple College	Rev. R. H. Conwell.
Philadelphia, Pa.	University of Pennsylvania	Charles C. Harrison, LL.D.
Pittsburgh, Pa. (4721 Fifth Ave.)	Miss Stuart's School	Ella Gordon Stuart.
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Central High School	Edward Rynearson.
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Shady Side Academy	W. R. Crabbe, Ph.D.
Pittsburgh, Pa. (Shady Av.)	Thurston Preparatory School	Alice M. Thurston.
Plainfield, N. J.	Plainfield High School	I. W. Travell.
Port Deposit, Md.	Tome Institute	Francis Ransom Lane.
Pottstown, Pa.	Hill School	John Meigs, Ph.D.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	Riverview Academy	J. B. Bisbee.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	Vassar College	James M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D.
Princeton, N. J.	Princeton University	Woodrow Wilson, LL.D.
Reading, Pa.	Boys' High School	Robert S. Birch.
Redbank, N. J.	High School	S. V. Arrowsmith.
Rochester, N. Y.	University of Rochester	Rush Rhees, LL.D.
Rye, N. Y.	Rye Seminary	Mrs. Life and the Misses Stowe.
Schenectady, N. Y.	Union College	B. H. Ripton, Dean.
S. Bethlehem, Pa.	Lehigh University	Henry S. Drinker, LL.D.
State College, Pa.	Pennsylvania State College	Judson P. Welsh, Ph.D.
Summit, N. J.	Kent Place School	Mrs. Sarah Woodman Paul.
Swarthmore, Pa.	Swarthmore College	Joseph Swain, LL.D.
Swarthmore, Pa.	Swarthmore Prep. School	Arthur H. Tomlinson.
Syracuse, N. Y.	Syracuse University	Rev. Jas. Roscoe Day, S.T.D., LL.D.
Trenton, N. J.	Rand Collegiate School	Edwin W. Rand.
Trenton, N. J.	State Model School	James M. Green, Ph.D.
Troy, N. Y.	Emma Willard School	Anna Leach.
Utica, N. Y.	The Balliol School	Mrs. Louise Sheffield Brownell Saunders. Edith Rockwell Hall.
Warren, Pa.	Warren High School	W. L. MacGowan.
Washington, D. C.	George Washington University	Charles W. Needham, D.D., LL.D.
Washington, D. C.	Friends' School	Thomas W. Sidwell.
Washington, D. C.	Gallaudet College	Edw. Minor Gallaudet, LL.D.
Washington, D. C.	Howard University	Rev. Wilbur P. Thrikield, D.D., LL.D.
Washington, D. C. (Wisconsin Av.)	The Washington School for Boys	Louis L. Hooper.
Washington, Pa.	Washington and Jefferson Academy	James N. Rule.
Washington, Pa.	Washington and Jefferson College	James D. Moffatt, D.D.
Wayne, Pa.	St. Luke's School	Charles Henry Strout.
Waynesburg, Pa.	Waynesburg College	A. F. Lewis.
West Chester, Pa.	State Normal School	G. M. Phillips, Ph.D.
West Chester, Pa.	West Chester High School	Addison L. Jones.
Westminster, Md.	Western Maryland College	Rev. Thomas Hamilton Lewis, D.D.
Westtown, Pa.	Westtown Boarding School	William F. Wickersham.
Wilmington, Del.	Friends' School	Herschel A. Norris.
Wilmington, Del.	High School	A. H. Berlin.
Yonkers, N. Y.	Halsted School	Mary S. Jenkins.
Yonkers, N. Y.	Yonkers High School	William A. Edwards.
York, Pa.	Collegiate Institute	Rev. E. T. Jeffers, D.D., LL.D.

DELEGATES REGISTERED, 1907.

ALBRIGHT COLLEGE, *Myerstown, Pa.* Clellan A. Bowman.

ALFRED UNIVERSITY, *Alfred, N. Y.* Boothe Colwell Davis.

ASBURY PARK HIGH SCHOOL, *Asbury Park, N. J.* Carl Brands, Eva E. Briggs, Fred S. Shepherd, Principal; Samuel D. Thompson.

BALLIOL SCHOOL, *Utica, N. Y.* Alice S. Butler, Edith Rockwell Hall, Principal.

BERKELEY INSTITUTE, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* J. W. Abernethy, Principal; Francis A. Smith.

BETHLEHEM PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *Bethlehem, Pa.* Thomas K. Smith.

BIRMINGHAM SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Birmingham, Pa.* Catherine Allen.

BORDENTOWN MILITARY INSTITUTE, *Bordentown, N. J.* S. W. Landon, Headmaster.

BOYS' HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Edwin Fairley, Theodore C. Mitchell, Emberson E. Proper, Ernest Riess, James Sullivan, Principal.

BREARLEY SCHOOL, *New York City.* James G. Croswell, Headmaster.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, *Lewisburg, Pa.* Thomas A. Edwards, John H. Harris, President.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* S. E. Berger, Francis Burke Brandt, John Louis Haney, Chessman A. Herrick, Francis H. Lee, William Hughes Mearns, Howard W. Nudd, Nathan Roberts, J. T. Rorer, E. A. Schnabel, George Alvin Snook.

CENTRAL MANUAL TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* John T. Brackin, Edward A. Partridge, William L. Sayre, Principal.

CHESTNUT HILL ACADEMY, *Chestnut Hill, Pa.* J. L. Patterson, Headmaster.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY, *Hamilton, N. Y.* Newton Lloyd Andrews, W. H. Crawshaw, Dean.

COLLEGIATE SCHOOL, *New York City.* Frank S. Morse, L. C. Mygatt, Principal.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, *New York City.* Joseph Allen, Barclay W. Bradley, Philip P. Brant, Edmund Burke, Walter E. Clark, Alfred G. Compton, Mario E. Cosenza, L. W. Crawford, George A. Daly, Louis Delomarre, R. B. MacDougall, Stephen P. Duggan, Mrs. George V. Edwards, George V. Edwards, V. Fuentes, Howard C. Glenn, W. B. Guthrie, Samuel B. Heckman, P. T. Kammerer, Carl W. Kinkeldey, David Klein, George Lamouret, Emory B. Lease, H. N. S. Lowther, George W. McClelland, Thomas R. Moore, Homer C. Newton, Engelbert Neus, Frederick M. Pedersen, Frederick G. Reynolds, George G. Scott, John R. Sim, Fitzgerald Tesdall, C. A. Toursauit, A. B. Turner, Joseph L. Tyman, Adolph Wemer, E. E. Whitford.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, *New York City.* Charles H. Elliott, Frederick A. Goetze, W. Addison Hervey, Ida M. Hollis, Gonzalez Lodge, Fannie P. Mathes, Nelson G. McCrea, Henry B. Mitchell, Julius Sachs.

COMMERCIAL HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* H. Nesbit Buddin, Esther V. Davis, Luise C. Ehlers, Elizabeth B. Janney, Maude B. Hansche, Agnes H. Long, Emma J. Longstreth.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, *Utica, N. Y.* H. W. Humble.

LOCATION.	INSTITUTION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Philadelphia, Pa.	Northeast Manual Training High School	Andrew J. Morrison, Ph.D.
Philadelphia (1720 Arch St.)	Philadelphia Collegiate Institute for Girls	Susan C. Lodge.
Philadelphia (1301 Spring Garden St.)	Philadelphia Normal School for Girls	J. Monroe Willard.
Philadelphia, Pa.	Temple College	Rev. R. H. Conwell.
Philadelphia, Pa.	University of Pennsylvania	Charles C. Harrison, LL.D.
Pittsburgh, Pa. (4721 Fifth Ave.)	Miss Stuart's School	Ella Gordon Stuart.
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Central High School	Edward Rynearson.
Pittsburgh, Pa.	Shady Side Academy	W. R. Crabbe, Ph.D.
Pittsburgh, Pa. (Shady Av.)	Thurston Preparatory School	Alice M. Thurston.
Plainfield, N. J.	Plainfield High School	I. W. Travell.
Port Deposit, Md.	Tome Institute	Francis Ransom Lane.
Pottstown, Pa.	Hill School	John Meigs, Ph.D.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	Riverview Academy	J. B. Bisbee.
Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	Vassar College	James M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D.
Princeton, N. J.	Princeton University	Woodrow Wilson, LL.D.
Reading, Pa.	Boys' High School	Robert S. Birch.
Redbank, N. J.	High School	S. V. Arrowsmith.
Rochester, N. Y.	University of Rochester	Rush Rhees, LL.D.
Rye, N. Y.	Rye Seminary	Mrs. Life and the Misses Stowe.
Schenectady, N. Y.	Union College	B. H. Ripton, Dean.
S. Bethlehem, Pa.	Lehigh University	Henry S. Drinker, LL.D.
State College, Pa.	Pennsylvania State College	Judson P. Welsh, Ph.D.
Summit, N. J.	Kent Place School	Mrs. Sarah Woodman Paul.
Swarthmore, Pa.	Swarthmore College	Joseph Swain, LL.D.
Swarthmore, Pa.	Swarthmore Prep. School	Arthur H. Tomlinson.
Syracuse, N. Y.	Syracuse University	Rev. Jas. Roscoe Day, S.T.D., LL.D.
Trenton, N. J.	Rand Collegiate School	Edwin W. Rand.
Trenton, N. J.	State Model School	James M. Green, Ph.D.
Troy, N. Y.	Emma Willard School	Anna Leach.
Utica, N. Y.	The Balliol School	Mrs. Louise Sheffield Brownell Saunders. Edith Rockwell Hall.
Warren, Pa.	Warren High School	W. L. MacGowan.
Washington, D. C.	George Washington University	Charles W. Needham, D.D., LL.D.
Washington, D. C.	Friends' School	Thomas W. Sidwell.
Washington, D. C.	Gallaudet College	Edw. Minor Gallaudet, LL.D.
Washington, D. C.	Howard University	Rev. Wilbur P. Thrikield, D.D., LL.D.
Washington, D. C. (Wisconsin Av.)	The Washington School for Boys	Louis L. Hooper.
Washington, Pa.	Washington and Jefferson Academy	James N. Rule.
Washington, Pa.	Washington and Jefferson College	James D. Moffatt, D.D.
Wayne, Pa.	St. Luke's School	Charles Henry Strout.
Waynesburg, Pa.	Waynesburg College	A. F. Lewis.
West Chester, Pa.	State Normal School	G. M. Phillips, Ph.D.
West Chester, Pa.	West Chester High School	Addison L. Jones.
Westminster, Md.	Western Maryland College	Rev. Thomas Hamilton Lewis, D.D.
Westtown, Pa.	Westtown Boarding School	William F. Wickersham.
Wilmington, Del.	Friends' School	Herschel A. Norris.
Wilmington, Del.	High School	A. H. Berlin.
Yonkers, N. Y.	Halsted School	Mary S. Jenkins.
Yonkers, N. Y.	Yonkers High School	William A. Edwards.
York, Pa.	Collegiate Institute	Rev. E. T. Jeffers, D.D., LL.D.

DELEGATES REGISTERED, 1907.

ALBRIGHT COLLEGE, *Myerstown, Pa.* Clellan A. Bowman.

ALFRED UNIVERSITY, *Alfred, N. Y.* Boothe Colwell Davis.

ASBURY PARK HIGH SCHOOL, *Asbury Park, N. J.* Carl Brands, Eva E. Briggs, Fred S. Shepherd, Principal; Samuel D. Thompson.

BALLIOL SCHOOL, *Utica, N. Y.* Alice S. Butler, Edith Rockwell Hall, Principal.

BERKELEY INSTITUTE, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* J. W. Abernethy, Principal; Francis A. Smith.

BETHLEHEM PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *Bethlehem, Pa.* Thomas K. Smith.

BIRMINGHAM SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Birmingham, Pa.* Catherine Allen.

BORDENTOWN MILITARY INSTITUTE, *Bordentown, N. J.* S. W. Landon, Headmaster.

BOYS' HIGH SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* Edwin Fairley, Theodore C. Mitchell, Emberson E. Proper, Ernest Riess, James Sullivan, Principal.

BREARLEY SCHOOL, *New York City.* James G. Croswell, Headmaster.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, *Lewisburg, Pa.* Thomas A. Edwards, John H. Harris, President.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* S. E. Berger, Francis Burke Brandt, John Louis Haney, Chessman A. Herrick, Francis H. Lee, William Hughes Mearns, Howard W. Nudd, Nathan Roberts, J. T. Rorer, E. A. Schnabel, George Alvin Snook.

CENTRAL MANUAL TRAINING HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* John T. Brackin, Edward A. Partridge, William L. Sayre, Principal.

CHESTNUT HILL ACADEMY, *Chestnut Hill, Pa.* J. L. Patterson, Headmaster.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY, *Hamilton, N. Y.* Newton Lloyd Andrews, W. H. Crawshaw, Dean.

COLLEGIATE SCHOOL, *New York City.* Frank S. Morse, L. C. Mygatt, Principal.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, *New York City.* Joseph Allen, Barclay W. Bradley, Philip P. Brant, Edmund Burke, Walter E. Clark, Alfred G. Compton, Mario E. Cosenza, L. W. Crawford, George A. Daly, Louis Delomarre, R. B. MacDougall, Stephen P. Duggan, Mrs. George V. Edwards, George V. Edwards, V. Fuentes, Howard C. Glenn, W. B. Guthrie, Samuel B. Heckman, P. T. Kammerer, Carl W. Kinkeldey, David Klein, George Lamouret, Emory B. Lease, H. N. S. Lowther, George W. McClelland, Thomas R. Moore, Homer C. Newton, Engelbert Neus, Frederick M. Pedersen, Frederick G. Reynolds, George G. Scott, John R. Sim, Fitzgerald Tesdall, C. A. Toursauit, A. B. Turner, Joseph L. Tyman, Adolph Wemer, E. E. Whitford.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, *New York City.* Charles H. Elliott, Frederick A. Goetze, W. Addison Hervey, Ida M. Hollis, Gonzalez Lodge, Fannie P. Mathes, Nelson G. McCrea, Henry B. Mitchell, Julius Sachs.

COMMERCIAL HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Philadelphia, Pa.* H. Nesbit Buddin, Esther V. Davis, Luise C. Ehlers, Elizabeth B. Janney, Maude B. Hansche, Agnes H. Long, Emma J. Longstreth.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, *Utica, N. Y.* H. W. Humble.

ends—one of these being the question of the taxation of college property and the other the question of a closer affiliation between colleges and the public schools of the State.

Dr. Apple and Dr. Magill were instrumental in calling a meeting of college presidents at Harrisburg, in March, 1887; and, in consequence of the action taken at that preliminary meeting, on the 5th of July of the same year, in 1887, the College Association of Pennsylvania was organized at this place. You know in the following year the College Association of Pennsylvania became the Association of Colleges in the Middle States and Maryland, and that in 1892, at Swarthmore, the organization took a wider scope and was organized as the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, and under which title it has been working ever since.

Now it is with especial pleasure that we greet you here this morning, for two reasons: in the first place, this is the place of your birth; in the second place, because you have come to what I regard as a typical college—not a university, but a college; and this organization was in the first place an organization of colleges. It included, of course, the University of Pennsylvania; but the institutions represented here were pre-eminently colleges, and college questions came especially to be discussed in the earlier meetings of the Association.

You have come to Lancaster County and Lancaster City—Lancaster City, a good old town, at one time, as you know, the capital of the United States for a short time, when the Continental Congress had to leave Philadelphia because of certain unpleasant features in the environment at that time and it met in the old court house that stood in the center of our city; and you have come into a region of which we may well say, with Whittier, in "Barbara Frietchie," as he speaks of Fredericktown in Maryland—

"Fair as a garden of the Lord."

I wish, for some reasons, that you could have been here in midsummer, as you met here in the first place. You speak of "a warm welcome" sometimes; I don't believe the season would have made it any warmer; but you might have seen this city, this country, and this spot perhaps under better advantages than you see it at this time.

However, you are here now and you are here in the interests, I take it, of the same questions that prompted the organization of this association in the first place. Franklin and Marshall College is not a very old institution in one sense; and yet in some respects it is older than the most of the colleges of the State—most of the colleges of this region—for the reason that in the very beginning of Franklin and Marshall College it drank deep of those fountains of learning that flowed from Germany when our American institutions of learning were very innocent of German thought and German philosophy. It was the good fortune of Franklin and Marshall College (Marshall College in the first place; Franklin and Marshall afterward) to be in touch with the thought of the fatherland; and hence it has come that there has prevailed in this institution not only the spirit of research and thoroughness which are characteristic of German institutions of learning, but a feeling for those branches of learning upon which at that time not so much stress was laid in institutions of learning—philosophic thought, for instance. Now the English and the American colleges and universities are glad to sit at the feet of the German teachers of philosophy. We drank of that fountain long ago; and there has been perpetuated, I think, in this institution, a stream of thought that has not been without its most beneficent results in the education which we have been trying to inculcate. Franklin and Marshall College has always stood for high, liberal culture; and it is not ashamed to-day to be a college. It does not claim to be a university. It lays stress on college education as liberal culture fitted to make men, preparatory to their taking up the study of a profession. We believe in professional studies; of course we do. We believe in the best possible preparation for technical work, or any work in life, if you please; we have no quarrel with technical schools and universities, not in the least; but we believe that whilst technical study is distinctly narrowing—as I think practice shows, everywhere—college training in broadening; and we believe in that broadening influence in the first place as of the greatest importance to give tone and character to our educational work in general. Then, in addition to that, we make no apology for being a denominational college. We are not denominational in the sense of being narrow or partisan in matters of religion; we require no religious tests, either of

professors or students; we are as free and as liberal and as generous as any one can be in all these respects; and yet we are not ashamed of being a denominational college in the sense that the college was founded by a denomination and is kept up by a denomination with a distinct purpose in view.

We are, I think, in full acord with a very able article that I have just read in *The Nation* this morning by Professor Alden, of Leland Stanford University, in which he maintained that there is a legitimacy "in the deliberate setting of collegiate education in an atmosphere fitted to promote certain tendencies in faith and morals."

Now faith and morals are one thing; the branches of knowledge which we study are another thing; but what father or mother is there that would not like a son or daughter brought up in certain tendencies of faith and morals? The time comes, undoubtedly, in university education, when a man must be free to move as he is guided and directed in his studies; but we believe that in the formation of character there is room for—that there is need of—an environment, an atmosphere, that will help to mold character so as to make men of faith, men of uprightness, strong, well-grounded, broad cultured, men who go out into the world and take their place in the different professions to speak for the cause which they represent.

One evidence of the ideals which we have cherished you will find in the literary society halls at this place to which I should like to call your attention. Nowhere else in the territory represented by this Association, except at Princeton, will you find any thing similar or equal to the halls which the literary societies here themselves own, and in which they hold their weekly meetings as purely literary societies. That goes to show the kind of ideal of culture which we emphasize. But I must not trespass upon your time, Mr. President and members of the Association. I only say these things in order to show that you have come to a college that believes in the ideals of culture to which I have referred. But let me say also that as you have advanced, as you have become a large and influential body, we have not been living in the backwoods either, without making some progress. We believe in scientific culture; we believe in laboratory work; we believe in thorough training—and we have not stood still in these respects, either. We try to offer the best that can

be had and given in these lines; and I invite you, whilst you are here, to visit our science hall, our laboratories, and see the work which we are doing in that direction. We believe in educational progress; but we want to stand by the old landmarks.

And now, speaking on behalf of an institution of this kind, in the name of Franklin and Marshall College and of the affiliated institutions—the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, and Franklin and Marshall Academy—I welcome you most cordially to these surroundings. All the grounds are open to you; and we shall extend to you such hospitality as we can furnish. We are glad you are in our midst; we bid you welcome, thrice welcome, to these halls.

RESPONSE BY

PRESIDENT JAMES G. CROSWELL.

President Stahr: For the Association of which I have the honor to be speaker at this moment, we thank you for the warmth, the grace and the courtesy of your welcome. As you have given me a figure of speech, I accept your paternal kindness with much pleasure. We come back as the children—as the child—of Franklin and Marshall College, to spend Thanksgiving. Where should a child spend Thanksgiving except with the old folks? And as we are twenty-one, the age of explosive emotions, will you allow me to explode? Most heartily, most gratefully, in return for delightful invitation and reception this morning, I thank you in the name of the body I have the honor to preside over. If I may take one moment in addition I will say that the Association accepts with peculiar pleasure your paternal words, your paternal and kindly advice, and your family feeling for us. We come, in fact, from many places, but I think we have preserved the Franklin and Marshall tradition uncommonly well. We of the Association have—and have every day more and more—a feeling for each other; a fraternal feeling which I am sure we did not need President Stahr to tell us was eminently rife on this campus and in this town. Coming up here this morning, I was addressed three times as "Friend"

by strangers; and when I asked the policeman the way to Franklin and Marshall College, he said "Right up that street, Brother!" I have lived in New York thirty years and I have never been on those terms with a policeman before.

As to the other feeling of which you speak as traditionary here, we share that also; we do believe in colleges; also, in preparatory schools. We believe in church traditions, we believe in denominations, on the understanding that we don't all believe in one denomination: "E pluribus unum" is our motto. This Association is one made up of a very great variety. It is an imposing thought, when one stops to think of the variety and the quantity of the different traditions that we do represent. We represent the Twin Empire States of the Union; we represent all the States—the Middle States which bind and hold the Union together. We represent not only one capital of the country, but three, as you say—Philadelphia, Lancaster and Washington. We have every reason to believe in permanent, faithful adherence to local tradition; and when the day comes, if it ever comes, that the American people fancy that our local traditions as you speak of do not count, or that small States are not as important as the large ones and that the little colleges with their personal traditions so dear and so powerful are not worth saving—when American localities grow to be pins in one universal paper, indistinguishable from each other, then, I think, we shall have lost something precious in the United States.

We thank you, sir, very much for your welcome. We are going to play the part of the returning son, I hope, and tell our mother college all the things we have been doing and how much we have been doing; and it will be no harm to brag a little. Things have happened in the last twenty-one years and this Association has been mixed up most effectively in the work of education. Before taking my seat as president for the year, I shall have the pleasure of introducing Dr. Sachs, of New York, who will represent to us those who have done most of the effective work of the institution in the last twenty-one years.

A REVIEW OF THE HISTORY AND WORK OF THE ASSOCIATION.

PROFESSOR JULIUS SACHS, TEACHERS' COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Just one year ago, those who attended the evening meeting of this Association, in the hall of the College of the City of New York, saw the venerable figure of Dr. Magill enter the hall; if they were near enough they observed him follow with his old-time interest the admirable presidential address of that meeting; to many of us he embodied the vital link that bound this flourishing Association to its modest beginnings. Had his life been spared, and his health permitted, he, and no other, would have been the proper interpreter of the significance of this occasion. With the consciousness, therefore, of a grave responsibility, and with a sense of my own inadequacy, I undertake to survey the progress of the work which the father of this Association would much more effectively have pictured. No one who knew him would for a moment have feared that the congratulations which are in order at such times would have betrayed any taint of immodesty. The credit that attaches to the performance of praiseworthy service should appear in the results achieved, rather than in our words.

Your committee has seen fit to assign the review to one who was admitted to your ranks after you had plotted out on large lines your aims and plans. It is these aims, as they have taken shape, and as they seem likely to develop further possibilities, that I shall endeavor to indicate.

For a brief space let us indulge in the luxury of revery; once, at least, at the close of the 21st year of its existence, this Association may fairly turn from educational problems of larger or minor scope to a cursory glance at—ourselves, our beginnings as an organization, our growth, our failures, if we detect any, our successes, if we can point to any of sufficient significance.

If the survivors of the earliest meetings of the Pennsylvania College Association compare them with these latter-day gatherings that have more than once, according to outward circumstances of meeting-place and program-arrangement, tested the capacity of great college halls, they may perchance long for the

intimate converse of those early days, when a small membership of kindred souls were placidly engaged in common and congenial enterprise. And yet, they ought not entertain such regrets; for this Association, in its present vigorous shape, is distinctly foreshadowed in the early records to which your historian has had access. Conceived originally as the College Association of Pennsylvania, it had no sooner completed its first convention than some of its incorporators, among them President Magill, urged in executive session that a committee appointed to report on Uniformity of Requirements for Admission to College confer with a committee of the Schoolmasters' Association of Pennsylvania upon this subject; it was its first invitation to a body foreign to itself to join in conference, and it is significant that it was a body of school men whose suggestions were invited. In the same meeting, but following upon the first suggestion, came the proposal to invite to co-operation in their deliberations the colleges of the other Middle States and Maryland. There exists no evidence of an immediate or tangible outcome of the conference with the Pennsylvania Teachers' Association; even if any recommendations of value on the matter of "Uniform Entrance Requirements" emerged from mutual discussion, they were left unrecorded; the possibility of consummating the larger organization, of focusing within a far more influential body the discussion on all questions of common interest, absorbed all other interests, but the legacy of the parent association to the Association of Colleges of the Middle States was a broad and liberal interpretation of its original object. I find that "Consideration of Qualifications of Candidates for Admission, and of the Character of Preparatory Schools" was included in the objects mentioned in the original draft of its Constitution; and the new Association assumed the same function, prompted not by a desire to exercise an irksome supervision, but actuated, as distinctly avowed, by the wish to unite the educational interests within its territory.

"To give emphasis to this, its vital aim," so the records read, "the executive committee of the reorganized College Association recommended to circulate its minutes among the preparatory schools." Some of the most valuable utterances of those early meetings were not entered upon the books in full detail, but the spirit of the new educational movement which prompted the

papers "On the *duty* of the University to the Common Schools," and "The Relations and *Duties* of Colleges of the Preparatory Schools," is unmistakable. The message of fellowship, of friendly guidance, on the part of those entrenched in well-established authority is the precursor of the more complete, more sympathetic relation of the following years, and it is fraught with all the more significance, for there were many questions of deeper college and university interest that awaited consideration, questions that might have absorbed the attention of the assembled college representatives. How much that is of permanent value, how much that bears the stamp of truly pioneer effort lies hidden away in the annals of such an Association as this! An occasional utterance becomes, under the inspiration of animated discussion, rich in suggestion, prophetic in quality. It awakens in the student of such records a becoming sense of humility to realize how much of what appears best in our recent discussions has been fully considered before, and again it may serve as a caution to the gallant Hotspurs of these our gatherings, not to give themselves up "to thick-eyed musing and cursed melancholy," if they do not achieve at the first onset the practical success that they believe is their meed. New thoughts that involve departure from existing practice, can not at once win general recognition; however impressive they are at the time, their significance may temporarily be lost sight of; arguments, though convincing, must be reiterated, must be marshaled in somewhat different fashion; and a generation may pass before a reform is fully established. Of such character are the addresses of several of our leaders who have passed away, or have retired from active duty; in Dr. Magill's paper on "The Object of Modern Language Study" we find views advanced that will have to be emphasized still further, before the doctrine is realized in practice; and Provost Pepper's analysis of "The University in Modern Life" establishes that institution's important service to the general cause of education in terms that acquire increased potency because of the growth and spread of the university idea. To several papers of Francis March (1889 and 1892) may be attributed the impulse that ushered in the selection of a uniform program of English readings for study in the schools. The idea of working toward uniformity which he formally enunciated develops later through the Ithaca resolution (1891) that recommended

substantially identical requirements in English, into the activities of the Committee on English, and points the way to some of the most notable measures of concerted action on other lines. And when James Morgan Hart in 1891, at the close of a general discussion on Language Teaching, made his plea for the cultivation of a feeling of homogeneity between professor and school teacher in the words, "If professor and instructor are to be in accord on all points, they must recognize in each other representatives of the same educational forces," he outlined in substance the basis of the later union. The conditions under which this union was effected were unusual, unconventional enough to warrant a fuller statement of them here; and the Swarthmore meeting of 1892 many of us regard as epoch-making in the history of the mutual relations of schools and colleges.

The New York Schoolmasters' Association had, during the several years of its existence, been increasingly disturbed by the lack of uniformity in the entrance requirements to the colleges; it assumed that if it could secure a hearing before the members of the Middle States College Association, and convince them of the distracting influence of such diversity, its difficulties might to some degree be relieved, and it made application that a committee of its members be granted an opportunity to discuss the question. Of the probable attitude of the College Association toward such a request no member of the committee was assured, nor had they been aware that there was then under consideration a resolution of Professor Nicholas Murray Butler's from the previous meeting at Ithaca (1891), "to consider the advisability of so extending the scope and membership of the Association as to include representatives of the Preparatory Schools in the Middle States and Maryland." With such a proposal under consideration, the College Association expressed its readiness to receive the delegation; it invited the New York delegates to a conference with its executive committee, who, on the following day, recommended immediate action in favor of making the Association henceforth representative of colleges, universities, and approved high and preparatory schools within its boundaries. It is well to recall the *spirit* in which the action of the College Association was taken, and it may not be inappropriate to dwell briefly on the significance to the general cause of education of this outspoken attitude of cordiality toward the

secondary schools; an attitude of such moment that we may safely consider this action one of the most important educational manifestations of the last quarter century.

It was, of course, part of a great movement toward readjustment, whose signs were visible elsewhere as well. Affiliation in organization, correlation in effort, have become such self-evident needs that the terms are almost trite, and it is a little difficult to recall the complete absence of tendency toward associated endeavor between college and school before 1892. Why, even the elementary school had admittedly a more distinctive individuality; it functioned with a recognized authority within generally accepted bounds, while the secondary school, whose limits downward and upward were undefined, received little or no acknowledgment for performances of its own, a Cinderella of the educational household. Was it not the current sentiment in many parts of the country that the secondary school ever needed watching, closest supervision, that without such insistent control it was sure to become derelict? In no invidious spirit we may claim that the Middle States Association has led all similar organizations in its cordial recognition of the individuality, the inherent worth of the secondary school. From the first, there appears in the published utterances of the parent organization abundant evidence of an hospitable spirit to all sound educational thought, whatever the source. It is as though the Association had been girding itself for the larger issues of the last decade and a half; in the bulletins of its activities during those earliest years are traceable the germs of many an educational scheme that is but now approaching fruition.

This same year, 1892, stands out prominently in the history of higher education; another and as widely known co-operative effort of colleges and secondary schools left its impress on the educational interests of this country; I refer to the selection of the Committee of Ten, and its nine sub-committees, in which for the first time school and college men engaged in conferences to formulate constructive measures for the conduct and organization of school curricula. As we now survey the work of this committee, and the embodiment of its results in the Report that has achieved national repute, and recall the various educational measures which have been the immediate outcome of this union, we realize that a radical change has come into the

relations of the several educational forces operative in our community, and the schools in particular have benefited greatly because of these relations. Vitality, significance, has been given to their work; it is worth living, when you are assigned an honorable part in an uplifting, inspiring movement that makes for distinct progress; there can never again be a dismemberment of interest, now that the college theorist and the school practitioner have co-operated to recommend safe lines of procedure, and to terminate the chaotic conditions that formerly prevailed in the schools. No one would of course assert that a completely satisfying arrangement was the immediate outcome, but the definition by the college men of their standards, whilst the school men disclosed the actual problems of the adolescent, led to a consideration of the larger question of the interests of the high school pupil; the sentence, embodied in the general report of the Committee of Ten, that "pupils were to be prepared for life, not merely for college," has been adopted as the corner stone of our educational faith, and we are now witnessing the process of adjustment to this doctrine in the requirements of some of our leading colleges. And yet it is in no partisan spirit that despite the more striking manifestations of that Report, we find that the *greater* outlook toward progress lies in such an organization as ours; in the quiet and continuous work, that is only possible when men in constant and intimate intercourse come to appreciate each other's powers and motives, there lies the guarantee of permanent betterment. The deliberate consideration that can only be obtained in prolonged conferences has more than once in our history helped to solve real educational difficulties.

And so we may rejoice that our Association has come to regard its mission as that of a committee in permanency, charged with the duty of promoting the interests common to school and college. Will it not be wise to curb our impatience, if things do not always and immediately move to that happy solution that we all desire? The very fact that our agitation for change, for reform, need no longer consider a small and segregated part of the educational world, but that, when it secures a hearing, it at once affects a large constituency, is a marvelous gain; we have once for all adopted a permanent bond of united action; progress is linked to the marshaling of large units; as in political strife, a

great and vigorous combination of forces must precede a liberalizing of those same forces. From this union there has issued abundant benefit to both contracting parties. To speak of the secondary school men first: the relations that have developed have assured to them many and varied benefits. The individual teacher need no longer indulge in idle complaints about the undue pressure that he experiences in his dealings with one or the other college; at the forum of our common council board it will appear whether his grievances represent actual hardships; frank discussion of difficulties leads to enlightenment, and the spirit of conciliation, of working in unison for a common cause, takes note of honest criticism, as it discourages captious fault-finding. The teachers have felt the necessity of self-criticism; they have found it advisable to scrutinize their own performances before they undertake to clamor for redress. And the colleges for their part have freely acknowledged that their former academic attitude was injudicious; it omitted to consider the real situation of the schools, whose difficulties the college officer of a decade ago did not appreciate; today these obstacles are better understood because of the frank interchange of opinions and experiences that has become a feature of our gatherings. A greater and a more inspiring outcome, it seems to me, than the satisfactory adjustment of questions of immediate utility, has been the insistence on common ideals that has marked all our important discussions. There has been effaced the conception that educational thought, educational progress makes its stronger appeal to the cloistered scholar than to the practical teacher; increasing acquaintance with each other's viewpoint has fostered increasing appreciation of each other's standards and motives. Our published proceedings are so much documentary evidence of the breadth of intellectual sympathy that has prevailed in our organization; and here again, the impromptu remarks from the floor that *follow* prepared addresses are the true index of the dominant spirit. In our published proceedings the future historian of educational movements will be able to trace the inception, the progress, the maturing of many important educational measures; he will, I hope, not fail to appreciate how much credit is due to the Society's Executive Committee; both the selection for our annual meetings of vital topics, and the skilful juxtaposition of representative exponents of these topics are matters

of no mean significance; and the constantly maintained interest of the most influential college officers speaks volumes for the delicate tact, the wise initiative of those in whose hands rested the policy of successive meetings. A survey of all the topics discussed since 1893 discloses the fact that the major portion deals with the relationship of school and college, the transition from the one to the other, the relative character of the same subjects taught in both; occasionally, as in last year's sessions, every topic on the program, including even the president's address, bore upon this inter-relation.

The unwritten law that this Association adopted for its guidance shortly after the amalgamation in 1892, and which established the alternation in the presidency of the Society between college and secondary school men, emphasized the identity of interests throughout the organization.

A study of the successive presidential addresses during the last fifteen years will reveal that they do not by any means always indicate the specific spheres of the several presidents; the topics handled pass constantly from general interest to general interest; they reflect a ready response, year after year, to any new and important issues in educational thought.

But *individual* presentations of opinion, whether by presiding officer or member from the floor, may be forcible or startling, and yet they may not create permanent effect; it is in the larger pieces of work undertaken by this Association that its enduring service lies.

And I would recall first that from the constituency of this Association have sprung several adjunct societies, who have developed a new activity of their own; such are the History Teachers' Association, vigorous and active at various local centers; such the Classical Teachers' Association, whose most important papers regularly appear in the Classical Weekly.

But never for a moment has the membership in these subsidiary societies withdrawn sympathy from the main organization, and the missionary work on which its committees have been engaged.

What has been the function of these committees? Briefly, it has been this: the translation of conviction into practice, and in the success of these various efforts lies the secret of the great influence that this Association has exerted. It is not necessary

to mention by name those to whose initiative these undertakings owe their existence; the swift response to their suggestions is proof positive that they gave voice and form to tendencies toward which their fellow-members had gradually matured in the free interchange of opinions that was current in the Association's discussions.

At the first regular meeting of the re-constituted Association, there was appointed a committee "to consider the present usage in the matter of entrance examinations in English language and literature in the colleges of this Association, and to recommend a scheme of uniform entrance requirements in English to these colleges."

The spirit that prompted the members of this committee to carry forward in collaboration with affiliated committees from other societies their labors against petty criticisms, obloquy and indifference; to suggest system where hitherto there had been no traditional usage, only wide discrepancy in theory; to improve upon their first efforts in a succession of revisions is one that compels admiration and profound esteem. Those who have not shared in the deliberations of such committees may not realize what a fund of valuable professional experience is crystallized in the ultimate reports that have gone forth; it is fair to say that there is a loss to the world of educators in the fact that many of the detailed discussions of these committees have remained unrecorded; the excellent papers which usually accompany the final presentation of committee reports represent only in part the quality of the deliberations themselves. In the particular case under consideration, the committee work on English, there is suggested for instance in the recent lists of recommended books to him who can read between the lines far more than a mere choice of reading matter; these lists stimulate to the exercise of preference; they permit adaptation to the tastes and environment of the pupil, and they mean to be, if the teachers would but interpret correctly, a protest against narrow and pedantic study of a subject that should above all else liberate, inspire, delight. The history of this committee has repeated itself in the various other committees whose labors have been ratified by the general Association. If we are to appreciate at their full value these efforts, we must remember that committee work of this kind acts as a safety-valve; it interposes a wholesome check

upon the random conclusions to which large public gatherings are prone; it substitutes caution, wise compromise for sudden impulses; it makes for deliberation, adjustment of interests; it reaches its conclusions on the basis of a comprehensive study of the situation. I doubt whether in any single case it has been found necessary to reverse the recommendations of one of our committees; incomplete for one or another reason the work may have been; inconsequential, never.

I have reserved for the last the consideration of that particular achievement which is unquestionably the most distinct contribution of this Association to higher education in the United States, the creation of the College Entrance Examination Board. We may not be ready for the final judgment on the merits of this Board; of its value in the present situation, as a means of assimilating the schools and colleges in a large part of the country, there can be no question; its phenomenal growth is an index of its immediate appropriateness and effectiveness. It has carried very far beyond the territory that limits our activities and our interests, the ideals as they formulated themselves in the minds of its founders; its influence has been felt even in institutions that do no acknowledge its methods nor apply its standards. If it represents, as I think it does, with a high degree of efficiency, the *organization* of educational effort, it owes this element of its unusual success to the boldness of inception, to the care and patient elaboration of detail that has originated within this Association. As before, it would be invidious to particularize; the College Board is the child of this Association; the encouragement bestowed by the united association on its earliest efforts was as necessary as the initiative that shaped its policies; a genuine alliance between conservatism and progress characterizes its actions; it has stood for compromise in the ideal conception of that term. "Earnestness of conviction," says Mr. Morley in his "Essay on Compromise," "is perfectly compatible with a sense of liability to error." It is in this spirit that the first organization was effected; college and school opinion within our own sphere had to be made hospitable to its proposals; in the theory and practice of administering its functions there was of necessity much that was novel, much that infringed upon habit and tradition. There were entertained in some quarters fears that a lowering of standards might issue from the continued

maintenance of these examinations; they have proved groundless; the tests of the Board have in fact given definite meaning to standards set; the elaboration of a *system* of measuring results which is responsibly administered has been necessary and has proved beneficial; the objections that have been raised apply to the inflexibility of rating results, a hardship that is inseparable from the conscientious administration of an elaborate examining scheme; but even in this direction the conference method adopted by the readers minimizes the grounds of criticism.

The supervision of the examination questions by the secondary teachers on the Board has proved the most valuable feature of the scheme. A well-considered plan, as this one undoubtedly was, does not reveal at once all its possibilities; within its future scope it may embrace administrative and educational questions not contemplated in its original conception. Even as the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has found, as it elaborated its pensioning scheme, in this very scheme a means of standardizing the colleges that desire to become participants of its benefactions, so the Examining Board, with an experience larger than has ever before been available, must sooner or later undertake the duty of securing better definitions of requirements, where present statements have been shown unsatisfactory. "If once infected," as a recent critic of the American college puts it, "with a more experimental and genuine pedagogical spirit, it may become the means of radical, even if gradual, reform."

Our Examination Board, on that point I think we are all in accord, does not represent the final step on the road to highest educational efficiency; in its compact organization, its growing influence on college-entrance control of a certain type, we recognize the conditions that must always precede freedom and flexibility. Great changes, greater than any of the last decade, are, however, imminent. In this month's "Atlantic," President Pritchett has demonstrated, I am fain to believe, that the adjustment of the college in a general system of education is the problem of the next twenty years; it is no longer, even at this moment, the crown of the educational edifice; and as it settles, to quote President Pritchett, into its proper place, of a transition school in which the student grows out of discipline to freedom, out of the tutelage of boyhood into the liberty of men, its relation to

the schools antecedent to it will perforce be changed. In the face of this impending general reorganization one may safely say, we have not reached the end of our usefulness; greater achievements are on the horizon.

We have been perfecting, as far as the outer mechanism can do so, the means of controlling the work of the secondary school that is to satisfy the college demand. But there is a higher goal even than the strength that issues from complete organization. The effectiveness of the examination scheme is to be regarded as a prelude merely to the legitimate self-control and responsibility of the secondary school.

The day does not now seem so faintly remote when the secondary school shall have become so strong, so efficient that *its* verdict will determine fitness for college. Just one hundred years ago the German educational authorities realized the futility of admitting students to university work by entrance examinations; Paulsen, in his "Geschichte des Gelehrten Unterrichts," draws a vivid picture of universities, weakly accepting unworthy and unqualified candidates to swell their numbers. The gymnasium that reared the pupil was to pass upon his qualifications in its final examination. A responsible school, a responsible body of teachers proud of their record, could be trusted to safeguard quality, to maintain high standards. True, Prussia at that time initiated a central authority that controlled appointments and determined courses of study. Have we no stimuli to insure high standards, broad educational aims, rational curricula? We may find a way of inspecting schools, of measuring teachers' attainments that will guarantee to the college the student-body it needs; let the college be as specific as possible in formulating the intellectual standards it demands of its entering students, the capacity, the power of initiative that it can develop further; I believe the schools will welcome the most exacting scrutiny of their teachers, their methods, their equipment; let such scrutiny be searching, not superficial and casual; let it be constant, but let it also be suggestive, helpful; the more the college officers investigate, the closer they will get to the schools, the more they will realize the school problems, the more they will appreciate the value of good teachers. No college certificate board, passing by clerical records on the merits of schools; but a systematic investigation, carried on rationally, consistently, by a number of representa-

tive professors from representative colleges, whose verdict finds ready acceptance. We have never attained to the highest reaches by conditions imposed from without; we thrive when we voluntarily accept, invite, critical judgment of our performances; when the schools are not under the stress of an occasional acute committee of inquiry, but when their plan of work, their practice, is as open as the day to any expert observation, then we shall have the field legitimately cleared for secondary education; the preparatory school will have lost its function; it must and will become a school for the training of the adolescent pupil; there will be various types, and there will be ample room for all of them; then there will be a possibility of working out a logical system of secondary education; there will be education, not cramming and coaching, and the colleges will find their reward in a better type of student.

And this Association, I am confident, will gladly co-operate toward these results.

If another anniversary like this one shall have brought us nearer to such a goal, we of the older generation, if we survive, may look back with pride upon the stepping stones by which we passed from the imperfect standards of an earlier day to the maturing of a sounder educational doctrine.

THE PRESIDENT. I have a friend, ladies and gentlemen—a school teacher—in whom the ego is pretty strongly developed, who refused to come to the meeting of this Association on the ground that teachers' conventions in holiday time were an invention of the enemy to prevent us from either resting or working. I think there is something in that. I think that is true of all teachers' conventions except ours. We do both here. I am sure it is a rest to the spirit to listen to such a paper as Dr. Sachs', illustrating the gentle patience, the calm persistence, and the abounding hopefulness of our twenty-one years and the victories that have come to us. I am sure it is a rest to the mind to listen to any school teacher who can write English like that. I do not wish to imply that there are not others, or that the standard of the Association is not at all times and places adequate; but I think we all feel—I dare say it in public here—that there is one of our number whose work, enshrined in that Valhalla, the annual report of the proceedings of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, is at

once grateful to the ear when heard, and delightful to read when printed. But now we must go to work. A recent book by a Harvard professor states, over many pages, the problem of education in the Latin language and literature—in a very pessimistic strain. It is said that one never learns Latin at all—that Latin in school is only a useful method of cultivating the "voluntary attention"; the more Latin you take, the stronger grows your voluntary attention. It gives me a great pleasure to introduce to you a more hopeful person, one who is himself a Latin teacher and scholar and who does believe that it is possible to learn the Latin language—Professor Gonzalez Lodge, of the Teachers' College.

CAN STUDENTS BE TAUGHT TO READ LATIN?

PROFESSOR GONZALEZ LODGE, TEACHERS' COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Your invitation to read a paper upon the general subject of the reading of the classics I accepted with pleasure as an indication of the widespread interest in the position occupied by Latin and Greek in our educational system, and with the hope that this influential Association might feel disposed to take some effective measures for the support and relief of us classical teachers who are still hampered by the traditions of a century of steadily declining interest.

I must preface my discussion by a brief statement of the objects we are seeking to attain in studying the classics in our schools, and I shall restrict my remarks to the Latin language, because Latin still holds an influential position in the curriculum. I shall not touch upon controversial matters any more than is necessary.

We study Latin in the schools, therefore, mainly with three ends in view: (1) Formal discipline. Thirty years ago teachers of the classics and other influential thinkers steadily maintained that the study of Latin was one of the best, if not the best, instrument for general intellectual development. With the growth in the science of psychology exception was taken to these sweeping claims, and for a while psychologists went to the extreme of denying that training in any particular branch of study strengthened the mind for the study of another and different branch. Their utterances were directed especially against classics, which, they affirmed, had no value so far as mental discipline was concerned, in preparing the mind for work in different fields. This extreme position of the psychologists has been greatly modified, and it is now recognized that while the claims made by the old adherents of classical training were entirely too broad, yet still study in any line is apt to have some good effect on the training of the mental faculties in general.

Professor Angell, of the University of Chicago, in the *Educational Review* for June, summarizes a discussion of this topic as follows:

(1) Certain habits gained in the mastery of one study may be appropriated directly in another; they may (2) be slightly

modified before such application and still show for their possessor a great gain as compared with the individual who has to start from the beginning. (3) These habits may be incorporated in larger habit groups, either with or without slight modification. (4) They may tend to impede certain antagonistic habits and in turn be impeded by other previously extant and inhibitory habits. (5) But in all these cases, the instances of inhibition as well as those of reinforcement and incorporation, it seems probable that a certain gain in the power to use and sustain attention will accrue from any purposeful and persistent intellectual application. . . . This principle probably holds true in memory, in reasoning, in observation, and in all the forms of mental activity which common thought and language distinguish. (6) What subjects best reinforce one another; what ones most inevitably conflict with one another; whether these relations depend upon the mode of presentation, rather than upon the subject-matter itself; these and other similar questions, too numerous to point out, must one and all be answered by experiment and experience. Dogmatism is wholly impossible in advance of such drastic and exhaustive investigation.

If this becomes, as seems likely, the attitude of psychologists in general, we classical teachers may legitimately hold that training in Latin exercises more faculties in more various ways than any other single subject in our educational curriculum.

(2) Latin is valuable for the opportunity it gives for training in general linguistics, and, by consequence, in the more accurate knowledge of our mother tongue. This claim has been made with a good deal of vigor in recent years and has not been controverted to any extent, although I am convinced that it has not been accepted as it should be by a large number of people. Here, too, the claims put forth have been greater than the facts justify. Training in Latin will not make a writer who has little or no linguistic sense an accurate user of English, and it is unquestionably true that a large number of our most successful writers of the present day have had little or no classical training. It is a fact that the best preparation for the idiomatic handling of English is association with people who use it with accuracy and taste. Children learn to use English very largely under the instruction of those who have no conscious knowledge of the formative elements in English speech, and therefore to the un-

thinking man the claim that a knowledge of Latin and Greek is necessary to use English accurately and with taste seems absurd. It is, however, not so absurd as it looks to be. While the ability to write English with fluency and taste may be acquired without any classical training on the part of the writer, we must remember that classical training has been an influence just the same, if not directly at least indirectly through long tradition, either on the part of the parents or teachers. For the standards of literary taste must be the standards of those books which have lived and will live as the monuments of our literary genius, and it is a matter of common knowledge that the imperishable part of our literature, and that which forms the standard according to which our present style is modelled, has been so profoundly influenced by the classical literatures that it is difficult to separate the English element from the classical. But apart from authors there will always be a large number of people with greater or less literary taste whose enjoyment of literature will be much enhanced by that apprehension of its niceties which can come only from a knowledge of the means employed, just as in the case of music appreciation is greatly furthered by even an elementary knowledge of the principles of musical technique, and it should be one of the aims of our education to increase the number of such.

(3) We study Latin in order to get a first-hand acquaintance with a certain amount of Latin literature. This reason is the weakest of the three that I am bringing forward. It is the weakest because the amount of literature thus studied is so exceedingly small. Many unthinking people maintain that the study of Latin is not necessary for this, and think that the influence of the Latin literature and its value can be apprehended by reading translations just as well as by reading the original. Unthinking people I say, because the overwhelming testimony is in favor of the statement that almost all that makes the pleasure of Latin literature is lost in translation. The nearer the translation approximates the idiom of the language used, the better it is—as a translation—according to the common consensus of opinion. And this is true; but a work like Jowett's translation of Plato, which is given as an example, is so nearly an English book that the readers of Jowett will unquestionably lose—not the contents of the original Greek, but the flavor, the setting, and in very large measure the effect. Now, even the small amount of Latin

literature actually read in the original serves to give the student some understanding of the Latin literary ideal, and even more than that, of the genius of the Roman people, such as the reading of the whole literature in translation would be powerless to give.

Now, if we accept these three reasons for the study of Latin in the schools as valid, the question at once arises, "Do we succeed in meeting these aims to the fullest extent by our present system of teaching Latin?"

Let us take the third first. Do our students really gain an insight into Latin literature even in the small measure expected in our schools? The answer is decidedly negative. This is due chiefly to our failure to get our students to read the Latin at all with intelligence. The reason for this seems to be that the standard of measurement of success is entirely inadequate. We judge of this success not by finding out whether the pupil can read Latin, but by finding out whether he knows the general content of a certain number of pages of certain Latin authors and whether he can put upon paper more or less careful translations of these selections.

So far as the second point is concerned, the conscious, accurate knowledge of English, the answer must also be in the negative because of the same reason, except that in this case no systematic effort at all is made to test the influence of the Latin study upon the better comprehension of the English language.

Finally, in the case of our first reason, namely, that of formal discipline, it would appear that the answer would be affirmative; but this, too, can not be strictly true in view of the results. In the very first year of Latin a great deal of analytical sudy is demanded of the pupil, but this demand becomes steadily less in the years to come and the control of the student's work by the teacher becomes necessarily less definite. The formal drill is, it is true, kept up in Latin composition, but only against great discouragements, and composition is confessedly the most unsatisfactory in its results.

If this indictment of the results of our present teaching is just, and I think it is, it seems to me emphatically the business of the Association with the power that it possesses to take measures to avoid the waste of time which, in view of the results attained, must be admitted in our Latin teaching. This waste of time might seem to be lessened in two ways—(1) by lessening the

amount required; (2) by changing the method of instruction. If we lessen the amount required, we shall unquestionably check waste, but this checking will ultimately take the form of lessening the time bestowed upon the subject, for if what I say is true, the waste is not restricted to any particular year, but runs through the course. Thus cutting the amount will probably not limit the waste on the time remaining.

It seems evident, therefore, that our remedy really lies in a change in the method of instruction. This is inextricably connected with the attitude of our colleges towards the entering student. The requirements for entrance to college, so far as they are formulated for examination, are, in the case of most colleges, briefly these:

(1) A knowledge of Latin forms and syntax, tested usually by an examination in prose composition, which is always, or almost always, unsatisfactory.

(2) The ability to translate with fair success some passage previously read in school.

(3) The ability to answer certain syntactical questions based on the passage translated.

It is not uncommon in addition to demand the translation of a sight passage, but very little stress is, as a rule, laid on this.

Now, I wish to emphasize what has been pointed out more than once, that with the exception of the examination in prose composition this test does not really measure the student's knowledge of Latin or show whether he is fit to pursue the subject after he enters college. The examination in prose composition is, as I have said, most unsatisfactory, and the majority of the failures are in this subject. The examination in sight translation, so far as it is given, is unsatisfactory mainly because the examiner hardly knows what to expect. After all, most examiners feel that they should not expect from the candidates what the candidate has had no means of learning, and as they are in most cases ignorant of what the range of secondary teaching involves, they are willing regularly to give the candidate the benefit of the doubt. No college instructor at the present time admits that the results of the entrance examinations are satisfactory in determining whether the student is capable of pursuing the subject or not, and all college instructors agree in wishing that a candidate for entrance should display a greater knowledge of Latin. The ex-

amination in the translation of a passage previously read is in general merely a memory test and not a test of acquaintance with the subject. The examiner would seem to be in much the same position that an examiner in any subject would occupy where the learning of a number of facts rather than the display of ability to handle these facts is the aim. It is the claim of mathematics that it teaches its students to work out problems themselves. It is the claim of Latin that to translate a passage of Latin into English requires the exercise of many of the highest intellectual faculties; in the case of mathematics the claim is founded upon achievement; in the case of Latin the claim is an iridescent dream. So far as achievement goes, every college teacher would gladly admit that a student who can translate a sight passage with correctness shows an acquaintance with the language that meets all his demands. But the natural corollary, that the training in the school should be directed towards producing just this sort of knowledge of the language does not seem to be as widely understood as it should be. This brings me, after it would seem a long introduction, to the purpose of the paper.

Every sentence is composed of words and expresses a thought. It is written down for the purpose of making that thought easy of transmission to countless readers; but they must have learned the language before this is possible. The learning of a language consists in the learning of the symbols which are used to embody the thought. These symbols are called words and phrases. Incidentally, and sometimes from necessity, the laws of combination of these words and phrases have also to be learned. In the case of a language like Latin a knowledge of these laws is essential. Common sense, it would seem, therefore, would demand that the work of a student in Latin should be directed towards learning these written symbols and the laws which govern their combination. Probably because this is the demand of common sense it is regarded by a good many people as absurd. "Learning vocabulary," they say, "is what you mean," and they heap a great deal of derision upon vocabulary, absolutely oblivious of the fact that without the vocabulary there can be no understanding of the text.

The most of our school editions of Cæsar, Cicero, and Vergil are so annotated that the pupil is not expected to learn vocabulary. I do not refer to the small lexica at the back of the books; even in addition to these all passages that require any thinking are

translated in the notes. It seems to be the aim of our various editions to relieve the pupil of the necessity of thinking at all, and the fact that this is not wholly accomplished is not due to any lack of effort on the part of the editor. The chief aim of a teacher of a book thus annotated must be to impress upon the pupil's memory the translation of a certain particular passage; but this quite reverses the sequence of the processes. The aim of the teacher should be to provide the pupil with a sufficient knowledge of the language to enable him to understand his Latin author merely as a matter of course. In other words the teacher should aspire to teach the student Latin and not to make a pupil learn a translation of Cæsar, to teach a student Latin and not merely a translation of Cicero, and the object of the examination should be to test the student's knowledge of Latin and not to see whether he has committed to memory a bad English equivalent of certain parts of his Latin author.

The teaching of the last century is responsible for the present condition of affairs. Cæsar, Cicero, and Vergil were from time immemorial used to teach Latin, but the accounts we get from old teachers of their object show that these books were used as a means to an end, the end being the learning of Latin. In the English schools the reading of the various authors went hand in hand with an immense amount of writing, and the ability to express oneself in Latin and, as the student went on, the writing of Latin verse with fluency was required of all. The transfer of this system to this country is responsible for many things. Our people, feeling no need for the ability to write Latin, either verse or prose, gradually and naturally restricted the teaching of those subjects. Latin verse has gone out, Latin prose is on its way, but the reading of the Latin authors still remains, and these seem likely to disappear, too, unless tangible results take the place of those we are familiar with.

Recently there has been a great searching of hearts among Latin teachers all over the world, and suggestions have been made from many quarters that the way to secure for Latin the consideration it deserves is to change the method of teaching entirely. If Latin is not to be necessarily for speaking in modern times, still there is a wide field open for it in reading alone. It is coming to be more and more generally understood that the quickest and most effective way to train a person to read a language fluently

is to train him by the so-called direct method. In reform gymnasien in Germany, in occasional schools headed by live instructors in England, in obscure quarters all over this country, individual teachers are teaching by the direct method. Pupils are being taught from the very beginning to understand the meaning of a Latin word when it is spoken. Teachers with no equipment themselves are striving against odds to introduce Latin into the classroom, partly under the stimulus of the colloquial exercises inserted in many of our beginner's books, partly in the hope, which is always justified, that the interest of their pupils will be aroused and maintained. Practically all of the reading of Latin in our schools for a century has been from printed text, and the acquaintance with Latin words has been merely an eye acquaintance. As a result the vast majority of our college students can not distinguish between the individual words in a Latin sentence that they hear read. The possibility of making a point in a speech with a Latin quotation such as has been so much desiderated here by comparison with earlier English practice is rendered nil, for the auditors can not understand the words uttered. If it were written on the blackboard it would often be readily intelligible.

The first step, therefore, in the reading of Latin with intelligence is to have an apprehension of the meaning and effect of a Latin word when heard. This means training in oral use of the tongue from the very beginning. It does not mean what is usually understood by Latin conversation. It does mean the variety of conversation such as is shown in question and answer where both question and answer are indicated in the passage under discussion. Such colloquial teaching has, however, another advantage in addition to making it easy for pupils to distinguish words when heard. It fixes the value of terminations and shows the effect of construction as no other kind of drill will. A pupil who has been trained to express his simplest ideas in Latin will not make the mistakes in forms which are made over and over again in college classes by students who have been studying the subject for five years. No measure has been devised for fixing the value of terminations as good as practical use of the forms in colloquial utterance.

I said designedly that this does not mean Latin conversation, but whether it does or not is largely a matter for the individual teacher to decide. Conversation in Latin is not particularly diffi-

cult. The Romans were in many respects like ourselves, or, as a clever English teacher has phrased it,

"Had not a Roman eyes? Had he not hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? Fed with the same food (except coffee and a few other trifles), hurt with the same weapons (except certain hideous machines), subject to the same diseases (except appendicitis and influenza), warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer as an Englishman is? If one pricked him did he not bleed? If one tickled him did he not laugh?"

There are, therefore, multitudes of fields in which the ancient and the modern are on the same ground—in which the modern could express himself with exactness and ease in the language of the ancient. Many people will think that such ability is worth cultivating in itself. But the majority of students, even if they could, are not going to have much opportunity to converse in Latin, and therefore conversational control of it, while desirable, is not essential. On the other hand, colloquial teaching leads directly to fluent reading, and it is here that our system of teaching calls most loudly for reform.

Dr. W. H. D. Rouse, of the Perse School, Cambridge, England, in a paper in the *Rivista di Scienza,* gives some examples of the direct method, from which I choose one:

. . . suppose the reading lesson to include the three lines of Martial:

Nullos esse deos, inane caelum
Adfirmat Segius; probatque, quod se
Factum, dum negat haec, videt beatum.

The master reads out the lines, which *ex hypothesi* have not been prepared by the class, and as a first step to explanation asks:

Magister.—Quid primum adfirmat Segius?

Puer s. Pueri.—Nullos esse deos adfirmat Segius.

M.—Quid deinde adfirmat?

P.—Inane esse caelum adfirmat.

M.—Conjunge haec mutato ordine.

P.—Segius adfirmat nullos deos esse, et inane esse caelum.

M.—Intellegitisne omnes?

P.—Nescio quid sit inane.

M.—Inane idem est quod vacuum, quod nihil in se habet, hic scilicet quod deos habet in se nullos.

P.—Iam intellego.

M.—Pergamus ad alteram sententiam: quid probat Segius?

P.—Nescimus quid probet Segius.

M.—Nempe probat hoc verum esse, nullos esse deos probat esse verum, probat inane deis esse caelum.

P.—Intelligimus.

M.—Quid intellegitis?

P.—Probare Segius nullos esse deos et cetera.

M.—Ita, quare igitur, qua ratione?

P.—Quod se beatum esse videt.

M.—Quando se beatum esse videt?

P.—Dum haec negat, videt se esse beatum.

M.—Quamvis igitur haec negat, quamquam haec negat, nihilominus se esse beatum videt. Scribite iam pedestri oratione id quod significat poeta; post haec vertite Anglice.

If it is admitted that the Latin reading that is done in schools should be an end in itself and not a means for obtaining control of the Latin language, then it follows that such reading should be done in such a way as to produce the greatest advantage; this means wholly under the eyes of a teacher. In the majority of cases, as at present taught, a child prepares his next day's translation at home. If he is conscientious he works out the lessons by means of commentary and vocabulary and arrives at a translation. Often he spends a great deal of time on a few words whose meaning is not clear, often a hint would have saved him much time and left him free to devote that time to further reading. If he is not conscientious he uses a translation and thereby loses almost all the value of the exercise. It is evident, therefore, that the translation at home of a passage from Latin into English involves, in most cases, a great waste of time.

How, then, should translation be conducted? Assuming that the pupil during his first year has been trained more or less in the direct method, assuming that he has always had to learn the meaning of the words which he was to use, and assuming—which is most important—that he has been made to use the words learned over and over again in daily drill, so that they have become a part of his unconscious apparatus, he is brought face to face with his first extensive reading. The teacher should know just what is new in the passage to be read the next day, and a certain part of the time of the class should be employed in going over this

passage, explaining the new words, and in every way putting the students into control of the instruments by which the ideas in the next day's lesson are expressed. His work at home should be the careful study of the new vocabulary, not necessarily by the memory only, but by writing a short composition involving these words in their idiomatic use. This composition may be written on a topic suggested by the instructor, or it may be the actual translation of certain set sentences. The object of it should be to fix the meaning of the new words in the student's mind. On coming to class the next day this exercise should be discussed, first with the use of colloquial Latin on the part of the teacher. Then the passage to be translated should be taken up, read in the Latin and translated at sight, such questions asked as would show that the class understood its meaning, and the rest of the hour should be taken up with a preliminary study of the succeeding day's lesson. This involves the keeping of a pretty accurate record on the part of both the teacher and the pupil of the new words learned, and the continual use of them by the teacher and pupil in writing and in oral practice. Such work is slow at the outset, and for a considerable time the progress seems to be that of a snail, but the strengthening of the pupil's knowledge is steadily increasing, and the time will come and come very soon when the ability to read will be shown by taking much longer lessons with ease. The reason for this lies in the much narrower range of the Latin vocabulary and the greater value of the individual Latin word. Taking four books of Cæsar, six orations of Cicero, and six books of Vergil's Aeneid, we found by actual count that in the Cæsar occurred 2,106 words, in the Cicero 2,117, and in Vergil 3,214. In altogether, 4,650, of this 1,954 occur five times or over, and, counting all occurrences, we note that out of 77,000 the words occurring under five times show only 4,956 occurrences. It is evident, therefore, that with 2,000 words the student can go very far in Latin reading.

Now, such a method involves several things; first, that the colleges should require for entrance the ability to read Latin of a certain range and with a certain vocabulary; second, the giving up of any requirement as to definite reading in the high school, so far as the learning of Latin itself is concerned. A certain requirement in reading, so far as contents of the matter read goes, might with justice be made. Then it also involves giving a high

school teacher the chance to select his own course of reading for his class, making him responsible for results at the end and stating definitely what those requirements are to be, but treating him as an intelligent being and confidently allowing him to arrange his course so that the results demanded will be gained. Give him freedom but hold him rigidly to account for the proper use of that freedom.

As I say, this scheme has been tried in Europe with success. It has been tried in various places in this country with results highly satisfactory to the teacher. There is only one great objection in the way of it, and that is the college teacher. The college teacher says that he wants the pupil to know Latin forms and Latin grammar before he comes to college, but in reality he wants to cover the narrowness of his own training by continuing in college to quiz his students on commonplaces of Latin syntax. He says he wants entering students to be able to read Latin, but if they had this ability the regular instruction of our freshman classes would have to be revolutionized. So, in reality, it seems to me that the college teacher does not want a class of students who can read Latin, or he would see at once that the way to get that class of students is to demand the ability to read Latin from students entering college, and to insist upon secondary teachers meeting that demand. If this were done we should be removing a difficulty, because the cry for relief on the part of secondary teachers in many parts of the country is taking the form of a demand for the lessening of the requirements in actual pages set and giving them freedom to choose their own course. We can trust the secondary teacher to do the very best that he can if we set before him an object worth working for, but, as matters now stand, no secondary teacher who loves Latin feels at all proud of sending up pupils who are prepared not to read the language which he loves, but to reproduce on paper a certain translation which has been drilled into them by hours upon hours of painstaking and unenlivened labor. Many a secondary teacher has a very small acquaintance with Latin literature because he never has opportunity to teach it; give him, therefore, a chance to read the Latin literature himself and he will inspire his students with a similar desire. Let him show that he can prepare them for real intelligent study of Latin authors and he will be glad to embrace the chance. Do not lay claim in the colleges to a

monopoly of the teaching of Latin literature (in my judgment more Latin literature is being taught in the high schools now than is taught in the colleges), but take the secondary teacher into your confidence and let him assist you in opening the wealth of classical learning to those students who are equal for it. And all this can be done by a modification of our entrance requirements and asking of the schools a single requirement—to be able to read Latin.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

PRESIDENT THOMAS FELL, ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, ANNAPOLIS, MD.—I have been waiting for some one else to open the discussion, but, as there appears to be a disinclination to do so, I have risen to make a few remarks upon the subject under discussion.

While listening to the paper that has been read, I was impressed with the thought that the writer demands a very great amount of care and attention for the preliminary preparation in Latin.

Now, looking back on my early life, I may say that I was educated in England, and that in the old country in those days the knowledge of Latin was considered of primary importance. I began to study it when eight years old, and by the time I was twelve I had finished reading Cicero and Virgil. I can remember that when I was about fourteen or fifteen it was a matter of pastime for me on a Sunday afternoon, if I had nothing else to do, to translate the psalms of the English Prayer Book into Latin Elegiacs. Latin was a part and parcel of our being—we lived and moved in an atmosphere of Greek and Latin, and consequently we arrived at the time when, as the writer of the paper just read refers to, we could talk and respond to our teacher in Latin, in a very pleasing manner.

On the other hand, when I look at the present generation, I see a very marked difference in the method of training. I have a son about fourteen years of age, and he has gone through the regular system of education provided in the American schools. He began to study Latin when about twelve years of age, and at the end of two years' instruction his knowledge of it is limited to an introduction to Cæsar.

Now, when I think of what I knew of Latin at the same age and compare it with what he knows, it seems to me that the whole question turns upon an inquiry as to the relative value of various branches of knowledge. Do we, in America, regard a knowledge of Latin of the same relative value as it was regarded twenty or thirty years ago in Europe? Is it not a fact that there are very many subjects now brought into an academic curriculum which demand the attention of the boys to the detriment of Latin, and which had no place formerly in a system of instruction? Consequently that we can hardly hope ever to get the rising generation to manifest that interest in Latin which would seem to be indicated by the writer of this paper.

I can imagine, in the case of my own son, that he will enter college and have the usual amount of knowledge of Latin to enable him to do so. During his college course he will read the required number of classical authors, but he will never take a living interest in the subject of Latin, so as to be able to follow and understand a Latin oration if delivered in his hearing.

He will, however, have been taught the fundamental elements and construction of the language, and have received an insight into the beauties of the literature. By this means he has achieved a valuable knowledge of the grammar upon which his own language is founded, and also acquired a beneficial mental discipline.

While I offer my congratulations for the extremely scholarly paper submitted to us by Professor Lodge and appreciate the high ideal that he has presented of what might be done, I think that the latter is in a measure somewhat beyond the ability of the ordinary youth prepared to enter college, and who subsequently passes through our hands as an undergraduate student.

Professor Julius Sachs, Columbia University.—I trust that I understood Professor Lodge's position in the matter; I hope he will refute me if I have mistaken it. We know perfectly well that in this country such results as Professor Fell has intimated as the outcome of the formal English training are quite impossible; but in view of the fact that our Latin instruction of the present day leads to such an unsatisfactory result that it seems a waste of the young men's time under existing circumstances, we must look about and see whether the difficulty is not one of method of presentation, and I for one believe that Professor

Lodge's position is absolutely correct. It is the bad method of teaching the Latin that is making it appear so extremely wasteful. We need a revolutionizing of the teaching.

The teachers of Latin ought to manifest in the treatment of their subject that they are living in modern conditions; they ought not perpetuate simply what has been traditional in this country. There has been a loss of direct purposefulness in the work, and it is something of that kind that Professor Lodge proposes to remedy. The point that stands out in his statement, and which, I think, is central, is that a complete change from the system of home preparation (which has been pronounced the strongest point in the American educational scheme—which I think is one of the worst) is necessary.

Our teachers do not co-operate with the pupil in the class work. The best part of the work is to be done in the class; it is not to be a recitation but a lesson—a co-operative performance, which does not mean that the teacher give all the work and that the pupil is simply the recipient, but that he constanly draws upon the pupil from his previous knowledge of the subject and, combining the efforts of the stronger and the weaker pupils, develops the knowledge of the subject-matter. Send the pupil, after such a performance in which all have co-operated, to his home, with no other requirement than that he should recapitulate what he has obtained in the class. The method of the teacher's sitting inert and listening to what the students have evolved from the dictionary is not teaching. It is a change of method that is called for. We are asking for the Latin what is required in other branches. We are not going to assume that it is only the Latin teaching that is poor. The teachers of mathematics have found out within these last years that they are obliged to change their methods; and those who are familiar with the working of the mathematical associations, in the Middle West particularly, know that there a great change has come over mathematical teaching. I have no doubt that other subjects, like modern languages, call for the same change. It is simply in line with these that a thorough change in the method of procedure in the Latin is called for —a radical one. If it will lead to a correct definition, amongst other things, of this whole question of sight reading (which is the bane of a good many teachers), that will be hopeful.

I wish that Professor Lodge had raised the question what

college professors really mean when they ask for sight reading. I know one college officer who thinks that sight reading means taking up a Latin book and reading it off as though it were English. Those of us who know the difficulties involved realize that is absurd. It only accentuates the uncertainty of the position. What sight reading is, and how students are to be prepared for sight reading, is a very important question which will come up under this remodeling of the Latin course.

SUPERINTENDENT RANDALL SPAULDING, MONTCLAIR, N. J.—I am much interested in what Professor Lodge has said, the substance of which Dr. Sachs has apparently approved and reinforced.

There seems to me to be a great waste of time going on at present, and that in one of the most popular subjects in our country. Its popularity is indicated in the statistics of the National Bureau. Thousands of parents require their children to elect Latin because they consider a knowledge of Latin to be evidence of literary culture. The subject is therefore one of great importance and we do well to reconsider our methods of teaching.

This discussion seems to me, however, a recurrence of an old discussion of more than twenty years ago. I hope that Professor Lodge will explain to us just how and to what extent the plan that he advocates differs from the old much approved and much disapproved, much lauded and much despised "methode naturelle." This plan may not be quite so thoroughgoing or so radical as the older one; it may differ in certain details of application, but is it essentially different? Is there not in each the same appeal to the ear as well as to the eye?

For my own part I am glad that this question of method has been reopened. I remember having once as a teacher a young man who taught Latin by the so-called Sauveur method, which in certain features strikingly resembles the plan outlined by the speaker of the day. In my judgment his work was successful, and when he finally entered on the practice of law our profession lost a valuable teacher.

My experience, therefore, has convinced me that there are among us many teachers who, with a proper enthusiasm, can use efficiently the plan under discussion, although, of course, the meager qualifications of very many teachers present a difficulty that only time and toil can overcome.

I am not going to elaborate, but I wish Dr. Sachs would answer this question—How does this method differ from the method that we discussed many years ago on the road from Princeton to New York?

PROFESSOR JULIUS SACHS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—I do not pretend to speak for Professor Lodge, but, as far as I am concerned, the method that I had in view, and which I have seen carried out in Germany, does differ very radically from the Sauveur method. The Sauveur method was distinctly mechanical —that is, it played upon a very narrow vocabulary, constantly twisting and turning the words in order to secure what was largely a recognition of the form without understanding the form. This method of which we are speaking plays with a great deal more freedom upon a much larger vocabulary. I disapprove of the value of the Sauveur method thoroughly. I remember that Professor Bocher, the famous French professor at Harvard, was a great believer in the Sauveur method applied to Latin, and he asked me to witness the efficacy of his work on his own son and daughter, who were at that time being taught by the Sauveur method. They had begun Latin with Cæsar—had studied five chapters of Cæsar. He said: "You can ask them anything you please. Put a question in Latin on those chapters of Cæsar and they will answer it." I did ask a few questions, but when I happened to put a question which involved one change of form from that they had gathered in the text, that is to say, when my question accidentally required a genitive instead of dative, all the wisdom was gone. There was a mechanical feature about the Sauveur method that doomed it to failure, and I don't think that is the case with the present system.

PROFESSOR GONZALEZ LODGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—I was interested in what Dr. Sachs and Dr. Fell had to say on the subject, and also I was moved to tell what was told me a short time ago by one of the teachers who has been visiting English schools during the last few weeks. She took the occasion to visit Dr. Rouse's school and was present at a Greek class. The direct method in teaching Greek is, by reason of the narrower vogue of subject, rather more unusual. She said that the class during all the hour that she spent there uttered not a single word

in anything but Greek. The range of what was said was not wide, but the class didn't seem to be afraid of the language. When it was necessary to explain, and when the explanation in regard to the interpretation of a passage was too complex to be put into easy Greek for the class—that is, involved more than the class could understand—Dr. Rouse would talk in English for a while, but he always came back to Greek, and after he had got through the explanation he put the question in Greek to the individual, "Do you understand?" and the individual pupil would say, "I understand," "I do not understand," whichever the case might be.

Now, the important point is that this method of teaching is not merely a method, that is, the method is not the only thing. It is a means of studying a certain amount of Latin literature, and it is a means of attacking that literature not in a mechanical way but in an intelligent fashion. The use of Latin in the classroom through colloquial back-and-forth talking is not for the purpose of developing particularly a ready control of a certain narrow range of sentences, but it is for the purpose of playing over the subject, the passage under discussion, and divorcing the students from any idea that Latin and Latin reading are separate and distinct things. That is to say, the class is always studying some piece of Latin literature, and as a means of that study they are using Latin, and in the use of this Latin they have to twist and turn the various ideas of any particular passage into different forms; if they are verse, write them out into prose, or speak them; if they are prose, vary the order, vary the construction, turn from accusatives to nominatives, change the idiom and use, perhaps, another word involving the ablative or genitive—the very acme of intensive study of inflectional effect. That, as I understand it, was quite lacking in the Sauveur system. The value of such practice in obtaining control over the meaning of inflection is very great for reading new Latin, and from that point of view I am able to say, with regard to Dr. Fell's objection, that Dr. Rouse maintains from actual experience over a number of years that the amount of time that they have for the teaching of Latin in English schools is ample to produce this control of the language. That I don't know from actual experience, I have only tried it in limited classes, but he says, in discussing the change in the English curricula, which is being

advocated very strongly, that with the same amount of time that they have had they can do vastly more, and by natural consequence, with the amount of time that we have we can do vastly more with the new system than we can with the old, because the old system never induced any power and the new system, according to his statement, does induce power; likewise according to my own experience, so far as I have been able to test it.

I had a communication from a teacher three or four days ago who had seen the announcement on the program that I was to speak, and wrote that the class in Cæsar had entirely discarded its vocabulary and the class in Vergil was about to discard its vocabulary in the book, and that the spirit of the pupils had been wonderfully changed by the consciousness that they could do something with the Latin that they knew. Now, after all, that is an immense advantage, it seems to me, in cultivating the right kind of spirit among the pupils.

PROFESSOR LOUIS BEVIER, JR., RUTGERS COLLEGE.—I have but a slight contribution to make to the discussion of Professor Lodge's paper, and the hour is so late that I shall confine myself to one or two things which I think should be pointed out. With his fundamental thesis I am personally very heartily in accord. I think it is only common sense that the elements, the words, and the phrases should be the things with which the pupils should somehow become familiar, and not a particular passage of a particular book, whether it be Latin, English, or Greek, or any other language; and if the purpose be to use a language orally and to understand it when spoken, it is fundamentally necessary that conversation be a large part of any effective teaching.

I can not, however, quite see the distinction that is made between the Sauveur teaching and the new device. I must confess that the distinction as drawn by Professor Sachs and Professor Lodge does not seem to me to be clear. In other words, I think there was great value in Dr. Sauveur's system, and that, intelligently applied, there is also great value in this, but on the conversational side no difference at all in principle.

There is one difficulty which is certainly very practical. From the intimate acquaintance that I have, necessarily, with the system of high schools in New Jersey, I must say, in all frankness, that any such revolution in method demands also a widely changed

method of preparation for the teachers. Any such system introduced at once would be farcical. It must come by a process of evolution and education. Perhaps a specific instance may be suggestive: I listened recently to a German lesson based wholly upon German conversation; no word of English was allowed in the exercise, which began by the announcement on the part of the teacher that *"Wir anfangen am Gipfel der Seite dreissig."*

Now, I have seen Latin well taught with the splendid inspiration of real Latin conversation, but I have yet to see a boy in college, prepared by the *méthode naturelle,* who really learned to read Greek accurately during his college course. It has been practically, in my experience, a flat failure. Still I think the fault lies not so much with the method as with its unskillful use. I think the essential thesis of the paper is sound; but it is a long journey, Mr. President, before Latin teaching can be made really effective in the secondary schools on that basis.

Dr. R. C. Schiedt, Franklin and Marshall College.—I learned Latin when I was eight years of age. . . . Not by any method of Sauveur's or any other method did we learn to use the Latin language conversationally; but we spoke Latin after one, two, three, four, five years of preparation, of about twelve hours a week—got a thorough knowledge of the forms and a wide acquaintance with Latin literature and slowly learned to think in Latin idioms. We simply were addressed in Latin by the teacher in the classroom, and he had his answer in Latin. At first it was rather slow; but he used to be very quick in his questions, and then he would say "jam perge," passing from boy to boy with lightning rapidity; and in the course of time, without anybody's special method, every boy in the class, in the gymnasium, answered in Latin, and in fact some spoke better Latin than they could speak German. I think that was the result twenty-five years ago. Since that time His Majesty has abolished the German-Latin composition from the German gymnasium. That composition, which required a man to write Latin on a given theme as well or better than he would write German, taught us to think in Latin. That Latin composition was counted a failure if there were five mistakes against the forms or against the syntax—a failure, no matter whether it consisted of a hundred pages or two pages. It was Latin composition or theme writing

which enabled the boys to converse in Latin and to express themselves with ease in Latin; and this habit of thinking and writing out a discussion on a theme which was thoroughly taught first in the classroom—as Dr. Sachs pointed out, it was that which enabled them afterwards to answer in Latin when any other subject was discussed in the classroom. There was no particular method, but simply the basis of a life training, the basis of hammering everlastingly on the same thing, the basis of learning a thousand or two thousand words in the first few years, before we knew, perhaps, even the conjugations—it was this everlasting hammering of twelve hours a week, morning and night (it had to sink in), which brought the result. There is no curriculum large enough to allow so much time to be given to a single branch. Moreover, I think that the English language in itself is not rich enough in its inflections to develop a large taste or a large appreciation for any other foreign language. I think that the average American boy is much more apt to grasp mathematical questions than he is to grasp language questions in the short time given to it. In my judgment it is largely due to the fact that his own mother tongue is too poor in its inflections to create special taste or superior capacity for language study, and that is one of the reasons why there are such terribly poor entrance examinations, as pointed out by Dr. Lodge. It is an awful thing from a German standpoint—to admit men to higher institutions of learning on such an examination.

SECOND SESSION

Friday, November 27, at 2.30 P. M.

THE PRESIDENT.—Ladies and gentlemen, with your permission I will reopen the session. I think perhaps the exercises of this afternoon should be described as an Executive Session; as the Senate of the United States closes its doors when it has something to discuss too precious for the common herd to hear. What we are to discuss is no less a subject than, "Are we Educating the Rising Generation?" I trust it will not be treated too sadly, or too dangerously. We have with us some gentlemen who certainly have the right to speak; and the subjects certainly are subjects that have a right to be heard. No subject is more profoundly interesting, philosophically or as a matter of practice, than the relation between the children as they are given us and the system which we construct, or partly construct to educate them. This interesting subject will be treated by Professor Lightner Witmer, of the University of Pennsylvania, who has very kindly consented to come and talk to us.

ARE WE EDUCATING THE RISING GENERATION?

(A) THE INDIVIDUAL VS. THE SYSTEM.

PROFESSOR LIGHTNER WITMER, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

I am not one of those who seek a Golden Age in the past and yet when I compare the college education which I received over twenty years ago with that which I am assisting to give at the present time, I find that in at least one respect the older conditions were better than the present. The classes in which I was taught did not average more than twenty students to a class. The classes of to-day number fifty, a hundred, two hundred, even three hundred students. Is it possible to educate a mob of several hundred students in the same sense in which we can educate a group of twenty students? I believe not. There is an essential difference in the character and the quality of the work that can be undertaken with small and with large classes. The drift

of enormous numbers of students to our colleges has caused, in my opinion, a deterioration of the educational product which is in direct ratio to the increase in the number of students. The first effect of the large class is the more or less complete suppression of the individual. We instructors must possess an unusually good memory if we are to recall the names and recognize the faces of one-half the students whom we are supposed to be educating.

The development of the human mind is promoted in one of three ways: the gaining of information, which requires and cultivates a memory; the awakening of appreciation through inspiration and imitation, which involves the arousal of emotion; and last but certainly not the least important, is the training of the individual student to think, which requires the formation of habits of concentrated and sustained attention. I would not minimize the value of any one of these functions. I think, however, we are all agreed that the gaining of information for its own sake is the least important method of training the mind. Nevertheless, I believe it is generally acknowledged that the secondary schools and colleges do this portion of their work best. Important as is the training of the memory, it is to the other two factors that I wish to direct your attention. A college education as an inspirational provocative of emotion comes in competition with the theater, the art gallery, the university extension lecture, the orator, good books, athletics, and many other social and intellectual stimuli. There is need in every institution for instructors with a sympathetic appreciation of art and nature, and with a wide mental horizon covering all interests, in order that they may arouse the students to enthusiasm and appreciative interest. But there is danger of dissipation when this kind of work begins to occupy the larger part of the student's time. It unfits him for the really serious interests of life. It fails to train his mind in the sense that it does not discipline his thought; it does not teach him to think.

It is through action that the mind finds expression. It is through action that the mind and body are trained to higher endeavor. The psychological significance of motor activity has led to an increasing emphasis for manual work and gymnastics. Motor activity does more than train the muscles; it cultivates habits of attention and emotional control, it develops

moral character. Thinking is a form of action. To train the college student to think is not an easy matter. The human being, whether child, youth, or adult, resists and fatigues under unaccustomed exercise. The first skate or the first ride of the season always provokes a muscular fatigue which endures for several days. This appears to our senses as a fatigue of the muscles. As a matter of fact it is cerebral in origin; it is brain tire. Thinking, especially along unwonted channels, also excites the same brain tire. Every new process of thinking can be acquired only through the overcoming of an apparent resistance of the brain. We see this even in work of simple detail; a difficult, but accustomed task we run off with ease; something that is unusual, if it be merely the adding of a column of figures, is accomplished only with internal resistance and a rapidly ensuing fatigue. I have had teachers in my classes in psychology who could not be induced to write down on paper a single statement of fact concerning the very children about whom they gave me most detailed and voluminous reports, admirably presented in oral form. Now, it is really no more difficult to write than it is to talk. It is simply a question of what is habitual. Thus, the student can think easily and to good purpose about getting his meals, the details of a foot ball game, what he has seen at the theater, and the feminine society it has been his privilege to enjoy. All this puts no strain upon his brain. But to think out a problem in mathematics, to read an English play with understanding and appreciation, to orient himself in and work his way out of some economic problem, these are brain processes which every implication of the youthful organism seems to resist. We all know to what lengths the student will go in an expenditure of time and trouble to avoid thinking. It is important to stock the mind with ideas, but it is of immeasurably greater importance to teach the youth to use the ideas he may possess. We should strive to extract mental action from the youthful organism. It would be just as silly to give the student a didactic course on athletics in the hope of improving his muscles, as it is to stuff his mind with the subjects of the curriculum in the hope that by some alchemic process the brain will assimilate the material and transform it into expressive action.

Now, it is my contention that you can teach students to think in groups of twenty, but you can not teach a class of fifty to think,

and it is hopeless to arouse mobs of two or three hundred to anything more than the retention and emotional appreciation of the ideas that you may happen to present.

A critical situation has thus arisen within the last twenty years through the growth of our classes. We instructors are being asked to perform an impossible task. Various attempts have been made at a solution. To some extent, the laboratory has saved the situation. When this word calls up to our mind laboratories of physics, chemistry, biology, and psychology, let us not forget that the laboratory method may be and is employed also in the teaching of such subjects as history and English. Indeed, it always existed and gave chief value to the classics and mathematics. These subjects still possess a great educational value, not because of any intrinsic worth, but because generations of schoolmasters have developed a method by which the student may be forced to think and work, and under our elective system we see the result. Wherever the student is free to choose between any form of laboratory work and the lecture course, he will inevitably choose the lecture. In my experience, and I have tried to develop both forms of college work, the student rejects the laboratory, not because it is more difficult, but simply and solely because the laboratory makes him work. It is precisely for this reason that the laboratory, as I have just said, helps in a measure to save the situation.

While the laboratory thus fosters and demands work on the part of the student as an individual, the laboratory also suffers from the present inrush of students. No sooner does an instructor build and equip a laboratory which is adequate for a certain number of students, than he is compelled to admit double the number provided for. The aim of the laboratory (and this in itself is not objectionable) is to handle as many students as possible with a minimum expenditure for instructors, and as a consequence automatic manuals are devised to compel the student to work for himself. But no manual, no matter how automatically it may perform its appointed task, will dispense entirely with the instructor, and laboratory work, like the lecture, deteriorates in quality in proportion to the number of students. As between the laboratory, which may and does teach the student to think, and the lecture, which may and does arouse the student to appreciative enthusiasm, I must ascribe to the laboratory the higher educational

value; and I believe that teaching the student to think, whether in a laboratory or classroom, is more difficult than to put ideas before him in an entertaining and inspiring way. It is, therefore, safer to entrust to young instructors our larger classes than to turn over to them, as we do at the present day, our laboratory and quiz work, leaving for the professor the relatively easy task of giving popular lectures. If the instructor has in mind the development of the individual he has before him an extremely difficult task. He must by cross-examination, called a quiz, first discover the student's intellectual, emotional and moral characteristics; he must ascertain his interests and prejudices, and on the basis of this individualization he must lead him on to higher and higher planes of individual endeavor. Thinking is only worth while when we try to do something that is just a little beyond our present powers. If it is within the sphere of easy endeavor, or if it be too much above us, it has little or no educational value. Hence the necessity for an inquiry into the individuality of the student. We make a pretense of treating him as an individual through the system of free electives. Desirable as the free elective system is, and it has assisted the laboratory method in saving the situation, we must not beguile ourselves with the vain hope that either the laboratory or the free elective permits of real individual treatment. It permits of smaller groups, but the groups in both the laboratory and the elective course may be and are so large that the student has no more personal identity than a single brick in the façade of a building.

To facilitate the training of the student to think, some co-ordination must underlie the presentation of the subjects of the curriculum. The college student today is much like the boy in school who, when reproved in his history lesson for not knowing where Rome was, replied, with a great deal of indignation, that he had had geography the year before, clearly intimating that he should not be expected to know a subject from which he had already graduated. It is not my purpose to discuss the details of this lack of co-ordination in the curriculum. I am seeking in this paper only to point out certain broad tendencies which slowly but surely work out their inevitable results. For example, our faculties have grown so large that they have disintegrated. The executive committee or college council controls the educational policy, or rather lack of policy, of the college.

We have learned that "in order to live we must let live," and within his own province the head of each separate department in our institutions is supreme and determines the character and method of his courses to suit himself. Moreover, in the colleges connected with our large universities most of our instructors are chosen because of their ability in research, and not primarily because of their ability to give instruction. In fact, we seldom know the abilities or disabilities of our colleagues in the art of teaching, and we uproot rather than cultivate any natural inquisitiveness in this direction. We know and honor our colleagues as the authors of important monographs. When instructors are chosen by the heads of departments because they give promise of carrying out the lines of research fostered by the department, this naturally has great advantages, which I feel we ought not to underestimate, but so far as the college is concerned it carries with it the great disadvantage of fastening the attention of the instructor upon the subject and not upon the student. In carrying on any form of mental activity with success the primary psychological problem is the distribution and concentration of attention, and when self-interest and our highest aims and ideals fasten the attention upon the subject-matter the pupil will inevitably suffer from neglect. This greater emphasis upon subject-matter is not a new tendency. In fact, for many years discussions of the educational problem have had reference to the training value of this or that subject. If the student is taken into consideration at all he is always given an abstractly average mind, whose supposed qualities and activities are borrowed from a traditional and useless psychology. What we need is a comparative psychology, based upon a study of many different individuals. I believe that any one subject may have as great an educational value as any other subject; it depends entirely upon the way it is taught and the characteristics of the persons taught. The abstract value of a subject should be secondary to its satisfaction of the momentary needs of the individual student. I should not be surprised if many of our students got more of an education, in the sense of a training of attention, emotion and will, while on the athletic field than from any professor in the college faculty.

The psychology of retardation, as this problem is being presented to us in recent times, will inevitably shift the point of

view from which we judge the educational value of college work. The derivation of the concept of retardation we owe, in the first instance, to an accident. In the year 1797 a boy, apparently about 12 years of age, was found running wild in the forest of Hoeyron, in Southern France. He was unclothed, and resisted the placing of clothing upon his back. He spoke no intelligible language, but made his wants known through inarticulate cries. He sometimes ran upon all fours. He selected his food by the sense of smell and drank by immersing his mouth beneath the surface of the water. He gave but few signs of intelligence. No one ever knew his origin or where he had spent the time between his birth and discovery. He was brought to Paris and exhibited before the Academy of Science, where he awakened the greatest interest. Was this the natural man, uncontaminated by a false civilization? If so, the study of his natural faculties and his training would reveal what the normal human mind was like, as well as the nature of the developmental process. On the other hand, the boy might be an idiot, deprived of the essential human faculty of reason. If so, neglect would be his portion, for no one in that day regarded the idiot as trainable. A French physician, believing the boy to be merely untrained and undeveloped, took up the task of education. After four or five years of work the boy proved to be an idiot, but Itard, in the meantime, had proved him to be trainable. In 1842 Séguin, enlightened by this experiment, contended for the first time that idiocy was an arrest or retardation of development, and laid down certain principles for the stimulation of the retarded mental and physical processes.

Since 1896 I have been devoting some attention to the study of children who are not properly designated feeble-minded, but who fail to make normal progress in the school because of physical or mental defects, their social environment or wrong educational methods. I believe that we are now able to give a definition of retardation which is both illuminating and instructive for the treatment of the normal child. Take a perfectly normal child of 6 years of age and let him arrive at the age of 10 with the same characteristics that he had at 6, and he will manifest retardation. Let him arrive at the age of 20 with characteristics entirely normal for a child of 6, and his retardation will not only be all the more severe, but will be the cause

of a permanent arrest of development, for the reason that he will then have passed the formative or developmental period. No child who fails to acquire a language before he is 14 or 15 years of age is likely to become facile in human speech. We all of us manifest an arrest of this kind toward foreign languages which are not acquired before the age of 10. What may be retardation for one may not be retardation for another. Children and youths of any given age vary greatly in physiological and psychological development. The physiological and psychological age does not correspond with the chronological age. Retardation must, therefore, be defined in terms of individual capacity for development. Any child whose brain is not developed up to the full limit of its capacity for his age is suffering from retardation, and a youth who arrives at the age of maturity with his brain below the level of development which it might have attained if other methods had been applied, will carry through life a permanent arrest of mental and moral development. Consequently, it may very well happen that the child who stands at the head of his class in school may be more retarded than the child who is at the bottom of his class. Indeed, I believe that the schools give less education to those who are better endowed than they give to the average student or dullard. The bright ones get an education, but they learn in the schools as they learn on the streets. "I do not know whether my boy *took* French in college or not," said the father in answer to a question, "but he was *exposed* to it." It is the function of the school and college to *educate,* not merely to make it possible for the child or youth to obtain an education.

While this concept of retardation in terms of individual development may be made clear enough, it can not be made definite, because it is impossible for us to estimate the natural endowment of any brain, except in terms of what it produces in thought and action. I have sought an objective standard, therefore, more particularly for public school children, in terms of age and grade. An elementary education presumably extends over a period of eight years. The child enters at 6 and finishes at 14, but how many children fulfil this requirement? In five cities studied by Doctor Cornman, comprising 5 per cent. of the school population of the United States, 61 per cent. are beyond the theoretic age limit, 13½ per cent. are two years or more behind the grade in

which they are supposed to be, and 5 per cent. are three years or more behind this grade. The presentation of these facts to the educators of the country will undoubtedly shift the center of educational discussion from the curriculum to the cause and remedial treatment of retardation. Already in New York City the Russell Sage Foundation has undertaken an investigation of this problem. The State superintendent of New York and the National Bureau of Education are sending out blanks to ascertain the number of over-age pupils in the grades.

What is true of the public elementary schools is doubtless true of the secondary schools and colleges, public and private. The search for the causes of retardation leads to an investigation of physical and mental defects and of social conditions. We are apt to turn aside from this problem with pity, but with a feeling of hopelessness, because we believe that these conditions are a necessary sequella of poverty. As a matter of fact they exist among the very rich to as great an extent as among the poor. If I had to choose whether the childhood of a boy of unusual brain capacity should be spent among the very rich, with their nurses, governesses, tutors, fashionable fitting schools and colleges, or whether he should be born and live in a home, waging a continual fight against poverty, but yet able to send him to the public schools and college, I should choose for him the latter fate in full confidence that he would reach maturity with greater force of character and a brain developed to a higher level of intellectual activity. I have studied and tried to help individual cases of retardation among the children of the rich, as a result of which I have acquired a great respect for the efficiency of the methods employed to enable the youth to jump the barrier of an entrance examination and get into college without the least semblance of a real education, and often in a condition of approximate illiteracy.

While I believe that the conditions in the private schools are quite analogous to those in the public schools, I have not yet succeeded in devising a satisfactory method for their investigation on a large scale, nor have I been able to take up this problem with reference to the college student, but undoubtedly the problem is there and awaits a solution. No single investigator or any group of psychologists can solve this problem satisfactorily. Every instructor who comes in contact with these students must

contribute his quota to our knowledge of intellectual and moral development in individual cases. The Legislature of the State of Massachusetts has recently required that every teacher shall examine the pupils in her grade at least once a year with respect to their sight and hearing. The day is coming when the grade teacher will be the repository of the best information available concerning the physical and mental characteristics of children. From the home we may expect but little assistance, for parents are too ignorant and the task of educating them is too great to be undertaken. But psychological insight will find its way into the schoolroom, for there is no doubt that some day we shall be able to educate the teacher to an understanding of the processes of individual development.

We who are college instructors should remember that we are first of all professional teachers of youth, and only secondarily scholars in this or that field of knowledge. There is no teacher in any college who should not be able to study the mental and emotional characteristics of his students and to ascertain the incidence and effect of the instruction which he imparts. In fact, the day is fast coming when he must be something of a psychologist in order to be a good teacher, and his function as a teacher with psychological insight will take precedence over his function as mathematician, biologist or classicist.

This shifting of the center of attention in college work will take place gradually. I would not, if I could, propose any scheme of reorganization in line with the suggestions that I have been throwing out in the course of this discussion. There is one modification, however, which I consider a step in the right direction, and which I risk placing before you for consideration. After an experience of some years in teaching the subject of psychology I can say that it makes very little difference to me whether a class is composed of sophomores, juniors, seniors, graduate students or teachers. Taking all these classes as they come, they do about the same grade of work. You can get more work out of a graduate student than you can out of a college student, because the graduate has less distraction and a more serious view of life. But so far as readiness of apprehension is concerned, I have had sophomores who were far more apt than some of my graduate students. I have had grade teachers who showed themselves to have a grasp of the subject superior to

that possessed by the average graduate or college student. In other words, a sophomore may be as mature intellectually as a senior or a graduate. So far as *preparation* goes, it is, in my experience, of negligible value. I do not find that those of my students who have had physics show any better grasp of the facts and principles of physics, as these are required for an understanding of the principles of psychology, than do those students who have had little or no physics.

But there *is* a line of cleavage, a basis of qualification, which is significant. I have poor students, mediocre students and good students. I should like to divide my classes into three groups with reference to their mental ability. I would teach these three classes by entirely different methods. I could give the members of each group an education in the sense in which I have been using that word for the purpose of this discussion. At present the average student gets something out of the work, but the good student is bored and not given sufficient mental exercise, while the poor student is "jacked" through the examination or pruned away with the mark of failure. We could certainly make a beginning by distinguishing between the honor and pass men. We give at Pennsylvania the marks *distinguished, good* and *passed* for work that has covered exactly the same ground. In my opinion the distinguished mark has little or no significance. It is and must be too easy to attain so long as we are required by the exigencies of the situation to pass the larger percentage of all the students coming to us. But the situation would entirely change if we could divide the class into honor and pass sections, and this is easily possible with our large classes. A pass mark in one section would give the student *distinguished;* in the other a mere *passed,* or perhaps in exceptional cases the mark *good.* This one step alone would enable us to take a more serious attitude toward the education of our students with reference to their individual needs. It would stimulate both sections, because for the one it would set up a high standard of attainment, which would be worth striving for, while for the other it would provide a standard possible of attainment. It would have the effect of counteracting the inevitable tendency of large classes to pull down the average pass qualifications of the class. We necessarily gauge what our students can do by what they actually do. Our students know this, and the mediocre

and poor students exert pressure upon the brighter ones to prevent their working as hard as they can, because this would have the result of raising the standard of class attainment beyond the level which the poorer ones can easily reach.

What I have said by way of criticism in the course of this discussion has been with no feeling of hopelessness over the present situation. We are educating more college students in a better way than we ever did before. It is precisely because the system is as good as it is that we can afford to inquire into the causes of our failures. These failures are doubtless more numerous than in our student days, but I doubt very much if the proportion of failures to the whole number of students is as large today as it was then.

THE PRESIDENT.—I am sure we are very much obliged to Doctor Witmer for his most thoughtful and stimulating paper.

An interesting thing about the English is that as a nation they have never thought at all about "Education," and they are proud of it. And yet, nevertheless, they have produced and are producing some—I say some, many—of the most perfectly educated men of this century, men who in every way measure up to any standard of culture—the highest standards of culture the human race can conceive.

We shall have the great pleasure of hearing Doctor Canfield, who has been concerned in a comprehensive investigation recently of "Some Famous English Schools."

SOME FAMOUS ENGLISH SCHOOLS.*

DR. JAMES H. CANFIELD, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Mr. President and Members of the Association: I have been asked to talk to you, briefly and very informally, about some of the more peculiar features of the great English schools. In considering these schools, to which such complimentary and worthy reference has been made by your President, you will find that there are three general divisions of what we in this country know as the public school system, or the public schools. There are the great public schools, such as St. Paul's, founded by Bishop Colet, which reckons among its great names those of Milton, Churchill, Burke and Bishop Butler; Harrow, with Byron and Peale and Sheridan and Palmerstone and Cardinal Manning; Eton, with Chatham, Fox, Shelley and Wellington; Rugby, with Thomas Arnold and Matthew Arnold and Tom Hughes and Dean Stanley. Then you will find another class, of later date, such as the Mill Hill School, near London, the great school of the Nonconformists, founded, I believe, by Lord Brougham; such as University College School, which follows the development of the University of London; such as the school known as Clifton College, in the suburbs, or in what is now practically a part of the corporate limits of Bristol; and such as the Manchester Grammar School, which is old enough, strong enough and noted enough to have had DeQuincey as its most celebrated graduate. And there is a third class, known as the secondary schools, such as the Secondary School of Manchester, the Secondary School of Birmingham, the secondary schools in London itself.

Each class seems to have quite a definite place and distinct place and a definite and distinct purpose. As illustration: If a lad is coming up through the schools of Birmingham and his parents have determined—or his teachers have determined—or his teachers and he himself perhaps have determined, for in England the teacher and the pupil generally determine the college to which the boy shall go, if he goes; the parents and the pupil and the teacher sometimes determine; the boy alone never determines, which is quite a marked difference between the Eng-

*Stenographer's Report.

lish boy and the American boy. If the parents and his teachers have determined that the boy in Birmingham shall go to Oxford or to Cambridge he will be entered at King Edward's School, the old grammar school of the town. If he is going into Birmingham University he will be entered at Birmingham High School, we should call it; in the Birmingham Grammar School they call it. If he is not going to either, but is simply going out into the business world, he will be entered in the secondary school, which is something like our commercial high school, though not going quite as far nor doing as strong work. That general division is true of nearly all the greater cities—the more important towns—Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, Birmingham, London itself. Each will show these three divisions.

Of these three classes you and I naturally turn first to the schools about which we know most, the schools of that first class, the older public schools. Of course, these are not public schools at all, but very, very private schools. They are not free schools, but fee schools, fees in them running from $500 to $800 a year for those who are boarders and from $125 up for those who are day pupils. The country schools, as they are called, such as Rugby, Harrow and Eton, have mostly boarders. King Edward's School, at Birmingham, and some of the minor or younger schools or "colleges," like Clifton, at Bristol, have mostly day scholars.

With regard to these schools—all of them—let me make a few statements of facts, leaving you to determine the possible helpfulness of comparison with our own and to institute the specific comparisons if you wish. And I will begin by saying that in England they realize quite keenly that education is a matter not so much of impact with a book or with problems and formulae as with a great-hearted, large-minded man of strong character; that after all else has been counted and weighed we find that what is needed is human interest, and we know that that which has stimulated the world in all the past and that to which we must look for stimulus and uplift in all the future is human character, and human character sympathetically manifested in relations between human individuals. That the strongest influence which can be brought to bear upon a lad to insure him a favorable start on the rather stormy voyage of life is that which comes from and with a constant and unselfish and loving contact

with some high types of manhood and womanhood. His teachers must have ample preparation for the work entrusted to each; there must be fullness and accuracy of information, general scholarship and special equipment must go hand in hand; but back of these and beneath these and permeating these ought to be the largest possible personality, in the largest and best sense of that word. There should be exactness of statement, but there should be also an everpresent sense of opportunity and duty and responsibility. Unceasing industry should stand side by side with unwearied patience. Most unswerving good faith and perfect candor, the strictest integrity, impartial justice, these must be quite as manifest as mere erudition. It is far better for an instructor to say frankly, on occasion, "I do not know," than to be lacking in that spirit which makes him ready and willing and even glad to be worn out in generous and gratuitous service, or in that reverence which gives man his true place in the economy of God. And all this strength and beauty and enthusiasm of character should be combined with such qualities as promptness and order, and tempered with friendship, sympathy and an affectionate regard for those under instruction. These characteristics, thus daily manifested, will bring the lad who is so fortunate as to be under their influence not into a condition of slavish discipline, but rather into a voluntary and very happy conformity with all that is right and just and sane and wholesome.

All this the English understand quite well, but it is not always easy to secure the men they wish. I said to an English headmaster: "Why is it that you do not have first-class winners of men in every teaching position in your school?" His answer was worthy of a man from Maine or Massachusetts. In a dry way he said: "Because we have no right to absorb in this one school all the people of that character and strength in the British nation." In other words, there are not enough first-class winners of men to go around; there are not enough men with positive teaching power to equip all of the faculties (if I may use that term) of the schools of England.

They find it hard to secure masters and to keep masters, because of the demands of the outside world. The outside world is offering today, through its great commercial organizations, through remarkable opportunities in professional fields, not only large financial returns—and I emphasize "not only" because I

can not believe that financial returns alone are determining the activities of the best men of England—but a larger opportunity for the exercise of personal power. When a man feels that he has power he has a natural desire to exercise his power, and can hardly be satisfied without this. If his hand upon the throttle compels the engine to yield to his will, determines its speed and its mastery of time and space, he is not going to take his hand off that lever for a minor piece of work, something that does not satisfy, that does not give the same returns to his personality. In England they say that they can not find as large and satisfactory returns for large and strong personalities in the positions of masters as the masters can find elsewhere, and so they go elsewhere. Not criticizing at all the condition of the schools, not finding fault and saying that there is ignorance and indifference, simply that the facts are against them, that is all; the conditions at present are against the schools.

They are finding also that the civil service is attracting more and more men, and especially—strange as it may seem—men who have a decided literary tendency and who wish to use their brains. They say: "We can not expect to go out of Oxford and Cambridge and live off our brains immediately; it would be pretty hard work; but we can find a place in the home civil service which will please us, which will give us an official position at London, or Liverpool, or Manchester, or Birmingham, or Leeds, or Bristol, or some of the other seaport towns which are pleasant to live in and are the centers of a good deal of intellectual life; and this position, with shorter hours and with no responsibility after hours are over, will give us a livelihood and leave us free mornings, afternoons, evenings and holidays, to follow our bent in the literary way;" and so many young graduates of the two great universities, young fellows who used to take up teaching, are now going into the public service. More credit is attached to such work since it came under specific and intelligent direction and regulation. In other words, by the development of a systematic and intelligent and clean and uplifting civil service England is commanding more highly trained and competent men. They are taking into the service of the government men who used to go into the teaching field. Certainly the government itself is to be congratulated, whatever the result may be upon the work of education.

Another reason why there is difficulty in getting strong assistant masters is that almost the only outlook for promotion, if they stay in the teaching profession, is the position of housemaster. The housemaster is one who has been at his work long enough (generally he is at least 40 before he reaches that position), has been sufficiently tested to make it safe to put him in charge of one of the houses in which the boys live. As a matter of fact, it is quite generally asserted that he is nothing more than a sublimated boarding-house keeper. His income may run up to $10,000 a year, but there is a very general feeling that this is detrimental to all true educational work, and there is a very general desire in England to change this. In some of the schools either housekeepers take the place of headmasters or their salaries are not determined or increased by their economic financial administration.

As to compensation, teachers start in the schools as assistant masters, perhaps at $500 a year, which includes, of course, room and board and general personal expenses during term time. This increases slowly, possibly $100 a year, up to sometimes $1,500, rarely $2,000. I heard of very few indeed who have gone as far as $2,500.

Assistant masters find promotion along two lines—their ability to teach and their ability in managing boys; and strange as it may seem to some of us in this country, the two do not always coincide. They are not promoted because of special erudition, and they are not promoted because of research work. The headmaster of a school said to me: "I wouldn't count it *against* one of my men if he had done a good bit of work in the literary way." I replied: "I am very glad that you wouldn't; it would be rather discouraging if you should." "Oh, no! Oh, no! I wouldn't count it against him at all; not at all. I can even conceive that he might do it, under proper circumstances, when it would be helpful to him; but, generally speaking, it would not be helpful to him, because I want all his time and strength given to his work and to his class each day." Then I recalled a remark that I heard made once by Dr. John Raymond, the first president of Vassar College, under whose presidency of the old Brooklyn Polytechnic I prepared for college. Some one said to him: "Doctor Raymond, why don't you *produce* something? Why don't you write something?" He answered: "Well, I don't

write anything because I wish to give my whole time and strength to my classes each day; but," he added, "I *have* produced two United States Senators, one Governor and at least a hundred men peculiarly competent in business and professional circles." The best possible form of production, it seems to me, for the teacher, the intelligent teacher, the born teacher, the winner of men.

And these associate masters are neither employed nor promoted until those who are responsible have determined one thing more, and that interested me exceedingly. They don't ask that a man shall be subject to any ecclesiastical test; they don't ask, generally speaking, that a man shall be subject to a credal test. But they do say that if he is still largely in doubt, if he has settled little or nothing, if he has not found himself and knows not which way he is going, he can not be a wise or proper guide for youth. They hold that a man whose belief is simply a negation, who has not yet put his feet firmly upon any high spiritual ground, is not the man to come into daily contact with boys in the way of leadership.

There is coming in England one other thought, one other method of advancement for the masters. The universities are just beginning to understand that sometimes it may be wise to select tutors at least from the big public schools; that there is a chance at least that a man who has been successful in instruction in the high schools, as we should call them, will be as successful in instruction in the college. So it happens that in Oxford and Cambridge there are a few men who have gone there from the schools. Though these are minor positions, they really constitute recognition and promotion. This certainly will make it easier for the public schools, or, as we would say, the secondary school or the high school, to secure good men.

I was told, however, that there was only one full professor (and he is in Manchester University) in any higher institution in England who was taken out of the lower schools. When I heard this it gave me great satisfaction to recall that the president of Chicago University was taken into a full professorship in one of the great universities out of an American high school; that the president of Iowa State University went to his first educational work out of the American high school, and that one of the most successful teachers—full professor of English today

in one of the best of our minor colleges—was called from an American high school. I do not believe that this Association can hope for any better result from the commingling of the two grades of institutions which this Association accomplishes than that there shall come to be an open passageway between the high school and the college for the men who are successful in the lower, because they are peculiarly of the temper, attitude and power which are needed in the higher.

In England they tell us that masters may be retained too long; that older men can not win boys. Generally speaking, they would decline to put a man who is past 40 in contact with boys. They are willing to put him in contact with young men, but not with *boys;* and therefore, generally, you find the younger teachers in the great public schools. And they are coming also to be willing to say that by nature and by temperament an Englishman is a poor teacher, that a Scotchman is a better teacher, and that an Irishman is the best of all. They hold that the Irish, with their sympathy, with a certain kind of alertness, with a temperament which, if not really visionary, at least is a temperament that makes one dream dreams and see visions, that the Irishman, when he is trained for his work, makes the best teacher that can be found. They are very glad to get him, very glad to use him in all their schools.

As I listened to one of the papers read here today I thought of what an English headmaster told me about the attitude of the English toward what we would call pedagogy. They call a teacher of pedagogy the "Method-master," and he said: "The average English teacher has very little use for the method-master, because the average English teacher knows very little about method." Keatinge, of Oxford, has had a hard bit of work, though he has been very successful, in building up an interest in instruction in methods for those who are to go out to teach. University men and what we would call high-grade men still have the impression not perhaps that anybody can teach, but that *almost* anybody can teach; that the teacher is born and not made, which is probably true, and that, being born, the teacher can not be improved, even by instruction in methods. That is not an unusual position, however, for college officers to take, even in this country. When I heard the statement made a few moments ago that the time must soon come when we of the colleges must

teach the teachers how to study their subject properly, and how to master it from the standpoint of theory, it came over me suddenly that a few years ago I carefully examined the subscription books of several of our leading educational publications and found that the teachers of the common schools in this country are the people who are taking the journals on pedagogy, the journals on methods, the best educational journals; and found that the officers of colleges and universities—well, I could not find them at all. Their names were not there. The public school teachers are going to teach us of the colleges before we of the colleges will teach them, in the way of methods at least. But the Englishman is moving very slowly along that line; he has very little use indeed for the method-master.

I have said that a good bit of literary work would not get in the way of the advancement of an English master, and that is true; but what we call promotion because of research work is almost unknown there, except in the universities, and there only among the more advanced men. The work which they do (and they do a great deal of it) is a by-product. A man writes some acceptable article for the magazines, or he writes a monograph on some special subject; but he does it because he is thoroughly interested in that subject, and the monograph or the magazine article grows out of his regular work and is a by-product in a most literal sense of that word. In other countries, or in one other country at least, there is a tendency to promote by publication. A young instructor says: "To the bookmakers belong the spoils. I desire advancement, a doctorate, which is conditioned upon something in print. Go to! therefore—let us print." Well, nothing of that sort is known on the other side. There is a great deal of intellectual activity, but it comes naturally and easily and as an outgrowth of the daily life of the teacher. As to promotion—he knows that if his entire time and strength, his sympathy and his ingenuity, are daily given to his students, full measure, pressed down and running over, he will be neither forgotten nor ignored. On the other hand, it must be admitted that as a class the masters of England are not peculiarly active intellectually along lines where in some other countries we look for mental activity. It was all summed up rather harshly by a headmaster, who said: "The masters and tutors of England are practically unknown at the British Museum: that tells the whole story."

For many reasons, some valid and others peculiar—to say the least—it is not easy to sit in classes, or to get in contact with the masters. But when you do, you find them earnest, sincere, patient men, of sane ambition and thorough training; men who are undertaking, in the very best lines known to them, to carry out the work of their day. In the older public schools, the more noted public schools, it must be confessed that you find antiquity of every possible kind and degree. As much antiquity of method as there is of buildings, and some of the buildings were put up in 1640; as much age in heating, lighting, and seating classrooms and in equipment and apparatus as in stained glass windows—and one wonders if as little light comes through one as through the other! There are great names, great and worthy traditions, and a great and worthy spirit; and these are of almost infinite value! But there are quite desirable things which are not to be found; and I was not surprised to have some of the more modern teachers in England say that the great public schools, the old public schools, are standing squarely across the path of modern education because they are standing still. How far, just how far, that may be true I dare not say, I can not say.

In these schools there is one unquestionably pernicious practice: that of "going in for honors," as it is called—which simply means premature, very premature, specialization. It is a system by which there is an artificial production of precocious scholars, forced under the stimulus of the recognition and reputation of the master, which is dependent upon this particular result of his work. It means that about one-fourth or one-fifth of the pupils are allowed to do that which they like to do, are stimulated in doing that to which they take naturally, are given much time and attention in building them along those lines; and the rest of the class are largely neglected and become what are known as "pass men," and the "pass man" at Oxford, Cambridge, or anywhere in the educational world is a very pernicious influence, a constant menace to sound education. The mere "pass man," who barely holds his own, without proper preparation, without interest, who simply takes what is given him without assimilation and holds it just long enough to get through his examination, who accumulates just points enough to secure a degree: wherever he appears, such a man should be cured or withdrawn—promptly.

There is another phase of this "honor" work which thoughtful

English educators are now studying most carefully. Just as the general result of studying for examinations is narrowing and dispiriting, so the result of studying for prizes and scholarships needs sharp limitation in order to reduce its danger to the lowest point. The rewards of scholastic effort should be the means by which poor men may receive an education otherwise impossible to them, and should never be used otherwise. The clear (confidential, perhaps) proof of financial need should be required and should be forthcoming. Even then the recipient should understand that he will be expected to return the amount received, without interest perhaps, as soon as he can do so without serious self-denial, in order that others may profit by this increased or recurrent fund. In other words, prizes and scholarships should not be permitted to add artificial stimulus to the work of those financially able, or to increase their bondage to a formal standard mathematically expressed, but should be plainly assistance given to students who have honorably shown their worth and promise and power while working under a free system, stimulated only by the possibility of continuing such work longer than would otherwise be possible. The interest and feeling with regard to these matters is so intense in England today that many most deeply interested think it quite possible that the whole question of prizes and scholarships will be entirely revolutionized within ten years.

The method of selection by which the English advance pupils of the common schools, as we would call them, beyond the grades—to an American is an exceedingly interesting one. Take London as an illustration: London selects 2,000 pupils a year to enter the public schools—work above that of what we would call the grades. These are chosen at the age of twelve, after not only the usual school examinations, but after careful personal observation, possible in the relations of the teacher to the pupil, and extended to inquiry made of and concerning his family. Those selected for advancement are allowed to choose their public schools, and their fees are paid by the city. The English say it is less expensive to pay the fees than to maintain high schools. In addition to the fees, "maintenance grants" are made, from $70 to $75 a year in the lower forms to a maximum of $300 in the higher. Something of that system prevails in nearly all English cities. The American public school system is like a magic wand

that we wave over all American society, and the best comes to the surface, precisely as particles of steel rise from the dust to kiss the face of a magnet. We still believe that the unlikeliest spots often contain the likeliest possibilities of American manhood and American womanhood; and we believe all must have opportunity if the best are to be found for worthy life and public service. The English can not accept that, can not quite believe that. They make the selection, and by the temper and promise of the child as these have appeared in the school they undertake to determine his future.

It is very much to the credit of all these English schools that there is less attempt to discover acquisition by the examination, and more attempt to discover power. They do not care quite so much for what the pupil is able to remember as for what he is able to do with the knowledge that he has; and they are now adding a third element and trying to cover it by personal and literary examination, or by both; that is, the element of promise. Not what he has accumulated, but what can be done with his accumulation, and what is his promise for the future. Very seriously, indeed, they are undertaking the task of making the examination in public schools determine these points.

How does all this bear upon citizenship in England? In this way: They are not teaching civics—almost not at all; they are giving but little instruction in the mother tongue; and they are not teaching history as we are teaching history, and they give very little attention to local history. They believe that these things can not be taught by books; that such instruction can not be given by any rule-of-thumb method; that at the age of a child in the schools it is difficult for him to comprehend much if anything about these matters. They are going on the principle that a patriotic and intelligent citizen as a teacher makes patriotic and intelligent pupils; and that no other method can accomplish the same result. They are trying to bring these children into close contact with men (rather more than with women; but with men and women, of course) whose daily life and speech is such as to be stimulating and encouraging and uplifting; men who are optimistic, who are earnest, who are intense, who are sympathetic, and who, because of their love of country and because of their intimate knowledge of the conditions of public life, will in teaching geography, history, and English—in all that they do, in all that they teach—will neces-

sarily turn more or less toward those subjects and themes which make for good citizenship. They are making excellent use of their great public monuments, the records of the past, in Westminster, in Trafalgar Square, in Bristol, or in Plymouth; commemorating glorious deeds of the past, and constantly seen of all men; all these they are constantly using in connection with the child-life of to-day. Through this personal influence, by these heroic voices from the days bygone but never forgotten, they are undertaking to create a sentiment in favor of that large and intelligent and generous life in England which shall mean ultimately, as it must mean everywhere, large and intelligent and generous public service.

THE PRESIDENT.—Before we separate for the afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, we have one more privilege. We must come back to our own country and hear from the Carnegie Foundation—that most interesting, perhaps, of all recent American growths. The Carnegie Foundation gives us not only the hope of the "haven where we would all be," but it has collected, in the process of investigating American education, some of the most edifying statistics. I have the great pleasure of introducing this afternoon Mr. Bowman, who has some thoughts and figures to lay before us bearing upon this main question of the afternoon. Mr. Bowman, of the Carnegie Foundation.

THE BASIS OF COLLEGE EDUCATION.

MR. JOHN C. BOWMAN, SECRETARY OF THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING.

The progress toward uniformity in college requirements for admission has been so far successful that practically all colleges and universities of adequate financial resources have either adopted a minimum standard resting upon the four-year high school or are making toward it as rapidly as local and institutional conditions will permit. Meanwhile the existence of irregularities in the admission of conditioned and of special students must be regarded as an anomaly that tends to make the uniformity nominal, rather than actual. I venture to question the wisdom of the varying treatment of an educational standard already agreed upon and announced.

Admission with conditions is intended, in theory at least, to render unnecessary the loss of a year to students who fail by a small margin to fulfill the regular requirements for admission. Such practice a generation ago had far more justification than at the present time. When high schools were comparatively few in number and courses in them meager, the colleges supplemented the work in these schools and permitted students to enter courses for which they had not opportunity for complete preparation. There was no idea of competition between the high schools and colleges for students; and under such conditions no one would doubt the value of discretion on the part of a college faculty in admitting deficient students. But since that time the development of secondary schools has radically changed the relations between colleges and schools. A concession designed for narrow application has been so widely extended in practice that a large part of the incoming class of a college is frequently conditioned; and leniency, theoretically justifiable if involving one of two slight conditions, has developed into indiscriminate charity. Such practice tends to defeat a real co-operation between the schools and colleges.

If we consider the stated requirements for admission to two hundred of the leading colleges and universities of this country, we have an apparent approval of a college standard based upon

a secondary school system; the entrance requirements, as stated, form an excellent basis of agreement as to the point at which college education should begin; college work is differentiated from high school work. But this uniformity disappears when a large part of the student body may gain admission, not by meeting the stated requirements, but on terms which vary from one institution to another. At Amherst, for example, application for conditional admission is "considered on its merits;" at Cornell the decision rests with the faculty concerned; at Johns Hopkins with a committee; Drake University waives two units; Marietta College concedes three units; Trinity College four; and the catalogues of New York University, Hobart, Lehigh, Princeton, Smith, Pennsylvania, Vassar, and the University of California, and others, give no information as to how the matter is handled.

All of the colleges in the group state definitely the requirements for regular admission, and when no reference is made to a provision for conditioned students there may be some implication that no such provision exists. But the fact is that practically all of the institutions in the group accept conditioned students and the omission is not serious or misleading. The objection has been made to a full statement of the requirements in the catalogue that this would tend to endanger a thoroughly honest stand in the admission of students; that it is wiser to admit a bright, strong student with two or three conditions than to admit another who may have only one condition, but who is reported as slow, or careless, or not physically strong; and further, that it is difficult, if not impossible, to formulate regulations which will indicate definitely the working of a wise and flexible discretion of a faculty.

These objections are not without force, and probable account for the fact that in so many instances no reference is made to the provision. But in my judgment the time has come when the entire question should be reconsidered by college authorities with a view to their best interests and the interests of the secondary schools. A few instances of the results of present practice may be helpful.

At Harvard a point is equivalent to about .6 of a unit; 26 points, or 16 units, make up the full quota of requirements for admission. Of the 607 freshmen admitted in the fall of 1907, 58 per cent. presented less than these 26 points, or 16 units. In some cases less than 19 points, or 10.8 units, were presented. The conditions

were not restricted to any one subject, or to any particular group of subjects. On the other hand, 107 members of the class presented more than the required 26 points.

Out of 697 students admitted directly from the secondary schools into the freshman class at Yale University this year, 391 were conditioned. In other words, 57 per cent. of the incoming class at Yale did not meet the stated requirements of 14.5 units. At Columbia, 145 men were admitted by examination into the *college* of the university. Seventy of these 145 freshmen met fully the requirements of 14.5 units. Of the 75 freshmen who did not present the full standard, the deficiencies ranged from half a unit to 7 units. Nineteen men were deficient in 4 units or more—that is, in at least one full year's work. In addition to this, 10 boys, from 17 to 19 years of age, who succeeded in passing in the examinations only 3.5 to 8.5 units were admitted as "non-matriculated students." Similarly at Amherst 49 out of 165 were admitted with conditions. Twelve of the 49 students were deficient 3 or more units. At the University of Illinois, 218 students were conditioned out of a total of 482; at Wellesley, 88 out of 383; at Cornell, 153 out of 862; at Princeton, 201 out of 360; and at New York University 36 out of 41 students in the *College* of the University. In the above instances students admitted from other colleges and those admitted as special students are not taken into consideration. In some instances, as at Cornell and the University of Illinois, the number of conditioned students includes those whose academic work, while not satisfying in full the prescribed entrance requirements, provides surplus entrance credit in other subjects. Such students are, of course, only technically deficient.

These figures, while they represent the practice at each institution named, do not readily lend themselves as a means of comparing the practice at institutions which admit by examination only with institutions which accept certificates for admission. Thus, at Columbia students are admitted only upon examination. The great proportion of students who are conditioned at Columbia have studied the various subjects. At New York University, on the other hand, students are admitted with certificates. Under this plan, when a student is conditioned it means, generally, that he has not studied at all the subjects in which he is deficient. There is evidently less justification for a conditioned enrollment

in the latter case than in the former. In the Middle West the universities have made much effort to perfect the certificate system, and in the first-class institutions adopting this system the admission of conditioned students tends to disappear. The University of Wisconsin and Oberlin College are types of this kind.

The data given, however, indicate with sufficient clearness that there is a wide margin between the announced standards of entrance and the actual bases of admission. In this twilight zone of irresponsibility there is a full field for the exercise not only of wise discretion, but also of indiscriminate excuse for unfaithful work, and above all an opportunity for the sharp-witted boy to play the college against the high school at the expense of both. Many of the boys admitted with heavy conditions even in the strongest institutions come from first-class high schools and academies, to which they should have been returned until they were ready for college. Some who were not able to make creditable marks in high schools sought and obtained admission to college after a half-completed course. In one case a candidate for admission as a special student frankly gave as a reason for his application the fact that he had failed to pass the entrance examinations. The sympathetic committee was unable to turn away from so ingenuous a plea. He was admitted.

The data concerning the variations in regard to the time in which deficiencies may be removed are of interest. In many instances no information is given. At Tulane three years are allowed for the removal of entrance conditions; at the University of Pittsburg, two years; and at the University of Kansas, one year. At the University of Alabama the deficiencies must be removed within a "reasonable time;" at the University of Oklahoma they must be removed as rapidly as the "committee may think best;" and at Drake University they must be removed "at once." These details are interesting in bringing out the confusion and the varying attempts to solve a difficult problem.

But the provisions by which the deficiencies may be removed, apart from the element of time, are of more serious importance. At institutions which maintain preparatory departments, such as Oberlin and Iowa College, the difficulty is easily met; and similarly by institutions which arrange special classes in preparatory work. But the disadvantages of combining college work and high school work are too numerous for discussion here, and as

colleges grow in strength they tend to discontinue all preparatory classes.

A number of colleges and universities have attempted to overcome the difficulty by stated examinations. Experience, however, has shown objections to this plan. First, the expense of a competent tutor to the student; second, the double disadvantage of meager preparation for college work and a two-fold schedule in the college and in the secondary school is apt to bring discouragement or failure to a student of ability. The result has been that both the tutoring and the examinations are perfunctory.

Harvard University has adopted a plan by which college courses may be "sacrificed" for certain courses required for admission; college work is accepted for entrance credit. Thus, a boy who fails in the examination in Virgil may satisfy the requirement by passing in *Latin B* of the Harvard curriculum. In this case *Latin B* is not credited to the boy toward his degree. At the University of Texas two-thirds of a university course absolves an entrance condition of one unit.

At Columbia an arrangement somewhat similar to the Harvard plan prevails. But if the student makes a fairly creditable failure in the entrance examination, he need not "sacrifice" the cognate college course in order to remove the condition. Thus, if a boy fails with a percentage of 35 in Virgil, and is able to pass in freshman Latin with a grade of A, B, or C, he satisfies the entrance condition and at the same time receives credit toward his college degree. Until the present year it was possible for a boy to remove an entrance condition in this manner although he had never attempted to pass the examination,

Obviously the adjustment between the college and the school is not perfect, but leniency on the part of the college does not improve the situation. The difficulty arises from the lack of clearness as to just what the entrance requirements actually denote. The catalogue statements represent them as indispensable. "A student who wishes to enter ..... college must pass" such and such exeminations for admission. It is not stated just why the particular requirements are set up as thus fundamental, but one of two theories is to be implied: the requirements embody an indispensable minimum of knowledge, or they represent an indispensable minimum of training. In other words, an ordinary boy, in order to have a good chance of success in

college, must either know the ground covered by the requirements, or he must at least have had the mental drill to be obtained through the mastery of the requirements.

In either event, the college is illogical when, after thus setting up its minimum, it proceeds freely to make exceptions to it. The records show that a large part of the incoming class has conditions, varying from one to five or six, and sometimes more. In the face of such administration, it is impossible to maintain that the entrance requirements are a real minimum; they are at best an ostensible minimum, any part of which is liable in most colleges to temporary suspension, and occasionally to complete abrogation.

It would seem that, to bring order out of this situation, it is necessary, first, to decide what the minimum is actually meant to accomplish, and second, what it must embody in order to achieve this purpose. So much being clear, it must be enforced as the *sine qua non*. Such a minimum would not be by itself the basis of college entrance, but an inevitable preliminary thereto. The student should unquestionably be required to do much more than this minimum before being admitted. In determining the content and extent of the additional studies, an entirely new set of considerations enters. The present arrangement fails to distinguish the general from the individual factor. In consequence, the entire situation is involved in confusion, the one sure result of which is to habituate young students to notions of promotion, despite superficiality and failure, now in this subject, now in that. The knowledge of every college candidate supplies him with a succession of instances of admission in which the stated stipulations are broken.

The special student is on a somewhat different basis. This provision is more in the nature of an equity proceeding, designed to supply a certain degree of elasticity to an otherwise rigid system of entrance examinations. It furnishes a way of meeting the needs of mature and serious persons who for one reason or another have not pursued the regular educational routine, and who, through extraordinary effort, have won a second chance; their seriousness of purpose, their maturity in development, amply compensate a technical deficiency in entrance units. No sensible person would propose to exclude from academic privilege the student who relatively late in life and after a sobering experience thus gains access to collegiate opportunities.

An analysis of the special student enrollment, however, discloses the fact that, instead of being limited to the use just indicated, the classification in question has likewise become a means of reducing or of evading entirely the entrance requirements. Unsuccessful candidates for admission urge and the college agrees that a system of entrance examinations does injustice to certain individuals temperamentally unsuited to display their acquisitions through written examinations. There is no doubt that this at times happens—though by no means usually in the cases in which it is alleged to have occurred. But in any event the remedy fails. Further, it is urged that through admission as special students college advantages may be extended to those who have had no access to adequate secondary schools. Whatever merit this contention may once have had, it has now lost most of its force. The enrollment of special students has increased, though the cogency of the argument has steadily diminished.

The terms in which college catalogues usually handle this subject are so vague that one is prepared to encounter great laxity and inconsistency in the actual administration. Harvard requires 16 units for entrance; but it admits as specials, without examination, students who are fit "to pursue the particular courses they elect." Out of 2,277 undergraduates there are 231 specials. The Johns Hopkins University requires 15 units for entrance; it admits with 8 units those "qualified by age, character, attainments, and habits or study." Out of 165 undergraduates, 23 are specials. The Department of Arts and Science of the University of Pennsylvania requires 14.5 units for entrance; but it admits specials on certificates covering requirements for desired courses only. Out of 299 students, 35 enter on these terms. Adelphi College requires 14.5 units; but it admits "specials" of mature age on "satisfactory evidence of proficiency," and in consequence it has 52 unclassified students out of a total of 170.

It is clear that vague descriptions such as I have quoted will not bar out unfit, undeserving, and incompetent applicants. If the regular procedure is in danger of being suspended in behalf of candidates who allege that they are mature and qualified, quoting the local clergyman and the family physician in support of the allegation, the college must create some effective machinery for intelligently and severely passing on such applications. A faculty committee, which for administrative purposes is liable to

reduce itself to a secretary, acting on a few written documents submitted by the candidate himself, can not avoid or effectively check abuse. In consequence, a measure designed to relieve mature workers of tests no longer important to them has become a back door for the admission of a miscellaneous collection of students of all ages and types, many of them boys of average age, who did not realize the clumsiness or difficulty of admission requirements until they themselves had failed to meet them.

The facts recited above are suggestive; they may indicate any one of several things. For instance, the desire for numbers being keen, lax provisions for the admission of special and of conditioned students may mean that a rigidly enforced entrance standard would threaten seriously to cut down enrollment, and that extraordinary measures have been devised to offset their effect. If this view is correct, the college has embarked upon a dangerous course which threatens its sincerity and its efficiency. Or, again, the facts may signify that there is no very close connection between fulfilled requirements and college performance; in which case it is held wise to admit deficient students of average age, or older, and to wipe out their deficiencies by some other method than through the entrance machinery. If this be true, it is time, not to make exceptions that confuse all standards and demoralize students, but seriously to face the problem of organizing preparatory education on a basis that is really vital and indispensable, and of devising machinery capable of enforcing it. It is bad pedagogical procedure to tell the prospective candidate that entrance to college involves a specific previous achievement, and then to familiarize him with the spectacle of frequent cases in which he learns that the terms have been partly or wholly waived. The ethical and scholarly standards would be higher if a less pretentious requirement were unflinchingly enforced.

GENERAL DISCUSSION.

DR. NATHAN C. SCHAEFFER, SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA.—Sometimes the best way out of a speech is to try to make it. I have listened with great interest to these discussions, especially to the last paper. It reminded me of what I heard in another State not long ago. They are having in that State an educational commission to revise the school laws, and I was talking to one of the leading educators, who said: "The commission has in its head only one idea, that of quantity. It has never thought of quality." A good deal of this discussion about rigid entrance conditions looks to me as though it were based entirely on quantity, without any reference to age and without any reference to quality. It is well known to those who are real teachers that sometimes a student who has graduated from the high school and who, perhaps, fails in his examination in Virgil, will, if he is given a chance in a college for ten weeks, show that he can do the work laid down; and, after all, in all promotions and in all admission to colleges the true test is not so many units passed at an examination, but ability to do the work that is laid down in the course. I am very glad that the western universities are giving young men—who perhaps find themselves late in life and enter a university at 24—I am glad that these western universities are giving such young men a chance.

In the Middle States we have more preparatory schools, but at least 40 per cent. of the children of Pennsylvania have no access to high schools; and when a college admits conditionally young people who have been taught to work on a farm as well as at school, and who when they are in the college show that they can do satisfactorily the work laid down in the course, the college is doing the individual and the nation good service. The college does not exist for a rigid system of standards, but the primary purpose of the college is education—service to humanity.

I fancy that I have studied the action of examinations about as much as the average man has studied them. I have to do with the licensing of dentists and of doctors, as well as of school teachers, and I found the other day that a young man had been kept from entering a State licensing examination because, according to the rating of one authority, he had but fifty-

eight units, whilst according to the rating of another authority he had sixty units; in other words, he was two units short; and how did he happen to be two units short? He had passed an examination in United States history, instead of American history, and when we went back over three years we found that American history in three years, under those examinations, had but three questions that would not fall under the head of United States history, and I asked, "In the name of all sound education, what difference does it make in the filling and care of teeth whether a person answered these few questions in the American history or not?"

Now, I am glad that in our rigid examination systems we are bringing to light the retardation of pupils, which is startling the country; but I am sorry that we are doing some things in the name of educational standards that are nothing but veritable nonsense. I plead for a chance for the student, and, Carnegie Foundation or no Carnegie Foundation, I praise the colleges that give the mature youth a chance to show that he can do the work laid down in the course of study.

Mr. W. N. Marcy, The Mackenzie School.—I had hoped that after Doctor Canfield had spoken today about English schools it would hardly be necessary for me to say anything. Probably my speech already betrays me, in spite of the fact that I have spent sixteen years as a teacher in this country. I was born and brought up and educated in England, in one of the schools Doctor Canfield was kind enough to mention as one of the great schools of England; that is, St. Paul's.

I spent eight years at St. Paul's School and three years at Cambridge University, and I regret that Doctor Canfield failed, as it seemed to me (if I may venture to criticise my elders), failed to bring out the one greatest feature of the English schools, the enormous momentum of the work that is done and the enormous amount of work that is done. The boys work from 9 o'clock a. m. until 1 p. m. without recess, and from 3 o'clock until 5 in the afternoon. Those are one-hour periods, and are all recitation periods. Such a thing as a period of study is unknown at St. Paul's School during the daytime. That means that the preparation for the next day's work must be done at night. I am not going to make a comparison.

We turn out men who, it seems to me, are healthy (I am not going to make comparisons), but who are able to stand that strain, if it is a strain, and to stand it for eight and nine years of preparatory school work; and I have always wondered why, if an English boy can work six hours for eight and nine years, why the American boy can not do the same; and I am afraid the answer is that the American parent won't let him.

I should be churlish if I ventured to contradict any of the statements that Doctor Canfield has made, and yet, from his own confession, he has found it hard to get into the life of the English schools; and so I feel sure he will pardon me if I call your attention to some facts that seem to me hardly accurate.

Before I pass to that there is one other point I should like to bring to your minds. Such a thing as stupidity in an English boy is not recognized. The English master does not recognize that a boy is stupid. He says, "This is the work to be done, and if you don't do it then I'll thrash you," and he thrashes him. Gentlemen and ladies, you will be surprised what a wonderful effect the end of a cane has in developing knowledge. I know very little of geometry, but all I do know I learned at the end of a stick. The point I am trying to bring out is this: In this country at least it is impossible to teach with the stick; but is it impossible for us to use other pressure, to bring other pressure to bear? My whole point is that the masters and mistresses in this country do not put their hearts and souls into it, and if they did a great deal more work could be done.

Now, if I may pass to some of the remarks that Doctor Canfield has made: I only venture to deal with those that seem to affect the crucial life of the English schools and the things of which I and other Englishmen are proud. If I have mistaken Doctor Canfield he will correct me. He has said that the English schools have only recently taken to sending their masters to important positions in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and I understood him to say, further, that there was but one full professor so taken from a private school. In my own school time, in the seven years I spent at St. Paul's, three St. Paul's masters were taken to Oxford and Cambridge University. One of them was made a full professor of Latin, one of them was made a university examiner, and one of them was made a full Greek professor. Those are three masters out of one school in the period of six or seven years that I can myself speak of.

Doctor Canfield has said that house-masters are perhaps in an unenviable position. If I may say so, the proudest man, I believe, in the English public school is the house-master. The house-master, aided (and this, again, is the secret of the great success of English schools) the house-master, aided by the sixth-form boys, who are the backbone of the whole house, has the entire moral charge of those boys, and lives their life from 6 in the morning until 6 at night. His whole being is wrapped up in the welfare and scholarship of those boys who are thrown in his charge. It is true that his living in some extent depends upon it; that for board and lodging he receives a certain stipend, but I never knew an English house-master into whose mind the question of money once entered; and furthermore, I never knew an English boy who ever said to himself, "I am paying $900 and I am going to get $900 worth."

There are other smaller matters that Doctor Canfield has spoken of, and that I haven't the time to bring up, and, as I say, I should feel churlish to bring up if I could, but if I could only—I have tried before today—if I could only impress on the teachers of this country that the fault is not with methods, but the fault is with the teachers of this country themselves, and I myself am one of them.

The Rhodes scholars are now at Oxford University. Last summer, when I was home, speaking to one of the Oxford examiners, I said, "What do you think of the Rhodes scholars?" He said, "I may say they are fine, bright fellows, but they are abominably trained." We think, in this country, that England, forsooth, knows nothing of methods. Again I have no comparisons to make.

President E. D. Warfield, Lafayette College.—There is one thing which occurs to me as worthy of a moment's attention in connection with the question of publishing in the catalogue the rule of the college with regard to entrance conditions.

Lafayette is one of the colleges that does not publish any such rule. One of the reasons why is that there is a body of students who will always take advantage of such publication and claim the right to be admitted with conditions, while we hold that there is no just reason why a student coming from a good school should be admitted with conditions.

There is another question which seems to me to be of importance from the college point of view. We hear a great deal today about the freedom of the professor, and the individual point of view is always, in my mind, a valuable asset. The attempt to reduce everything, as has been said by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, to mere quantitative statements, the attempt to reduce everything to units or to precise regulations, takes away a great deal of personality. In our Faculty we have men who insist that conditions in their department shall be made up before the first of the next January. We have other professors who insist that no conditions in their departments shall be made up in the course of the first college year, as the student has enough to do to do his current work. The latter view particularly applies to purely preparatory subjects, which are supposed to strengthen the men generally, and not to be specifically demanded in the further pursuit of some college course. Thus, for example, there is no work in the freshman year which requires the immediate use of the requirement in history. Hence we ask that the student shall make up that work in the next summer vacation, and he is recommended to have regular instruction in that department. If all of the regulations as to conditions were published in the catalogue it would require almost another catalogue to contain them. This is one of the points with regard to which we should encourage in the college freedom of action and a study of the needs of each student.

I have very great sympathy with what Doctor Schaeffer has said, but I have long ago come to the conclusion that there is no room in the college for the special student. The co-operation which is necessary between the secondary school and the college in a community such as ours really demands that we should send the irregularly and the imperfectly prepared boy back to a good preparatory school. Not because of any hardship that we would lay upon the boy, but for the simple reason that what we are seeking is that every man should be taught to make the most of the opportunities that are being offered him by contemporary education, and that he should realize that though he can get into college and get along in college, perhaps even stand high in college because of his native ability, the year that he has lost out of the preparatory school—that last year in a good secondary school—is a loss that he can never repair. Many of us know

how serious is the loss that came to us when somehow we missed an opportunity in our early educaiton that we have never been able to go back and repair.

Let me add one other word in connection with what has been said today. It was said this morning that we were losing the Latin prose composition. I hope that those who are teaching Latin will see to it that the teaching of Latin prose is not only not done away with, but that it is strengthened.

I had an unusual preparation in Latin, and I elected Latin through my own college course at Princeton. But when I went to Oxford it amazed me to see the way my contemporaries there could use Latin. Their knowledge of Latin prose and verse composition put them in a position to deal with any critical question of Latin translation that was far above my training. The significance of this lies in the fact that he who is thoroughly grounded in composition not only knows how to read Latin—knows what an author says—but he knows what he might have said; knows the distinction the writer intends to make. We all know that in English, in French and in German, in the teaching of all modern languages, the value of composition is coming to be more and more recognized. We shall not have capable Latin scholars until the preparatory schools send men to college thoroughly equipped in Latin prose composition.

THIRD SESSION

Friday, November 27, 8 P. M.

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS.

THE ONE THING NEEDFUL.

PRESIDENT JAMES G. CROSWELL, THE BREARLEY SCHOOL.

The task of the teacher, be it in school or in college, is not an easy one. There are a set of unpleasantnesses peculiar to our profession, of which the most unpleasant is that, as a profession, we are subjected to more criticism, just and unjust, than any other trade, or profession has to endure. We school teachers are criticised by our pupils, by their parents, by the citizens of our republic, by all the newspapers, indeed by all those who think they can see a gap between their ideals of what we ought to do and our performance of our tasks. Like the ministers of the gospel, we are always under fire from those we would serve, and in some sense perhaps we always deserve it.

But, like no other profession, school and college teachers are also exposed continually to shots from the rear. Our profession suffers more from self-criticism than any other; more than in any other profession, except perhaps that of the artist, the humblest workers behold the glory of the ideal. We all see the hilltops of our aspiration and we observe distinctly one another's distance therefrom. Teachers collected in convention suffer from special forms of depression, in addition to our chronic despondency. We exhibit a "conventional melancholy." It is brought on or much increased by such heart-searching exercises as we have had this afternoon.

The best of us, perhaps the best more than the worst of us, are prone to utter on these occasions somewhat despairing statements over the condition of the teaching world as it exists today. Just at present there seems to be an unusual abundance of such pessimistic views before the public. In Professor Barrett Wendell's last book, for example, entitled "The Privileged

Classes of America," I find these impressive sentences: "There are few colleges of America in which we are not often confronted with bachelors of arts who are virtually uneducated." Or this: "All over the world the traditional methods of education have been tried and found wanting." And here, again: "From my point of view, the younger generation seems hardly educated at all."

In the presidential address of last year President Woodrow Wilson made some statements of the same sort, viewing the matter from another angle. "I have had the experience (which I am sure is common to modern teachers) of feeling that I was bending all my efforts to do a thing which was not susceptible of being done, and that the teaching that I professed to do was as if done in a vacuum, as if done without a transmitting medium, as if done without an atmosphere in which the forces might be transmitted." Or this: "I wish to state these things, if need be, in an extravagant form, in order to have you realize that we are upon the eve of a period of reconstruction. I never attend any gathering of this kind (that is, a teachers' convention) that I do not hear the frankest admission that we are in search of the fundamental principles of the thing we are trying to do."

This view prevails with Mr. Abraham Flexner in his recent book on the American college. He speaks as follows: "Our college students are just as lacking in spontaneous and disinterested intellectual activity as in more strictly instrumental power and efficiency." Or this: "Our college students are and for the most part emerge flighty, superficial and immature, lacking, as a class, concentration, seriousness and thoroughness." The drift of his arguments, he thinks, establishes the proposition that the very qualities which seem to secure the degree B. A. would secure a man's dismissal from any other business whatever.

It is small wonder that, bearing the burden and heat of the day and getting so bad a harvest, school teachers should sometimes grow faint and weary. The prospect does at times look dark. I myself received a letter recently from a school teacher in New York, a teacher who had been successful in every way, having done, perhaps, the best work in the city and received much reward in the good will and affection of her scholars. She was writing on business, but her pen, straying to

the general discussion of the teacher's work and its reward, summed up her experiences as follows: "Sometimes, in the last few years, I have been made to feel, considering the tortures that are applied to me, that school teaching might be characterized as General Sherman described war."

I am here tonight to deny the validity of all such statements and all such criticisms, long and short, if considered as serious attempts to assess the total value of American educational work of today, though I am willing to accept them as suggestive propositions to open up our discussion of a topic I desire to introduce.

I do not believe we are going to destruction. I do believe, however, that *"Porro unum est necessarium."* With us, as with the young man in the Bible, there is something necessary to perfection which we do not now notably possess in the American school life. With all our endeavors and success there is something missing. I propose, as well as I can, to offer suggestions which may at once account for these animadversions of our critics and do something, on the other side, toward describing the better state of things I desire to see.

In the first place, there is a misunderstanding or two to clear up. School teaching is not heaven, either to the teacher or learner. We should not try to make our schools too blissful. The unsuccessful effort to make heavenly schools will account for a good deal of the melancholy and despair which at times settles over us. The simple fact, hard to remember as it seems, is this, that the world in which teachers live and scholars work is a curious world of itself, full of odd geography, but it is neither hell nor heaven. It is true, many of our experiences as teachers give a certain plausibility to my friend's saying that school teaching had some resemblance to the adventures of the Inferno, or at least we will confess that it suggests the classical Hades. I have often thought, as I read the sixth book of the Æneid, that Virgil must have foreseen school teaching. I know the wheel of Ixion; it suggests to me the routine in which I have spun round, Tuesday following Monday, Wednesday Tuesday, and so on for twenty years. Catiline has abused our patience longer than he did that of Cicero; Homer has, as the Greek epigram says, supported more lives than ever the Iliad made the prey of dogs and birds. I know the stone of Sisyphus, rolled

everlastingly up hill and everlastingly bounding down again. Has it ever happened to you to hear a pupil, after two years of algebra, inquire in a startled voice, "What is an 'unknown quantity?'" As for the banquets of Tantalus, we teachers have educational luxuries set forth by publishers of schoolbooks and makers of committee reports which evade our touch as we grasp after them in vain.

School is not heaven, but school differs profoundly from any circle of any inferno. The world of school is, beyond all worlds, the place of hope. However crude and imperfect our present arrangements, however crude our processes, however unsatisfactory our results, however deeply condemned may be the young men who take our degrees and diplomas, there is no sense in speaking in despair of the worst school that ever was known; there is always a possibility, nay, even a probability, of improvement. Hope is the great commodity of all schools. Anything may happen in a school; even the imps of the pit may in one hour become angels of light; not only become so, but remain so. A boy man turn into anything, even into a man. The worst, yes, the worst possible system of education turned in the worst possible way, by the worst possible hands, has on occasion transformed itself, slowly or suddenly, into a thing of greater and greater beauty.

But if school is not heaven nor hell, neither is it earth. The common blunder in judging the world of school and college is to presume to judge this fluctuating, adolescing mass by the fixed standards of the adult world. Such is the blunder of the critics above quoted. Men judge schools, schoolboys and even schoolgirls by the standards of adult males. They do not recollect that our profession differs from all others in that its business is not transacted upon their earth at all. Our world may not be in heaven, but neither is it on *terra firma.* We live and work in the borderland, the "never, never land," the limbo of the innocents. There lies the "bonny road that winds across the ferny brae" of youth. The school world is full of hope, but it is not a land of attainment. School is a place of still unrealized ideals, of loyalties to the causes that can not be described as lost, because they have never been won. Why should we judge these half-defined cloud lands by the standards of any old man in this old world?

Such an answer I should make to most critics such as I have quoted. Such are the feelings with which the American, the school teacher or the schoolboy himself, is apt to answer all critics of his shortcomings. Even parents, in one of their two moods, are indulgent to these arguments. As Professor Briggs very keenly says, "Many parents regard school and college as far less serious in its demands than business; a place of delightful irresponsibility, where a youth may disport himself before he is condemned to hard labor."

Possibly, however, we Americans tolerate childishness too long and too much in school and college. We may let our children remain too long immature, under the influence of these feelings which I have described. Our critics may be right in this regard. American teachers are not awake to the actual danger of the situation. Let us consider the matter again more carefully.

After all, more does go to the making of man than quick senses or volatile attention or the hopefulness and charm of childhood. If we have no more than that in our schools we are not contributing our proper share to the maturing of the nation. To remind us of a better ideal, let me read to you President Wilson's description of the educated man as he gave it at Haverford this month: "The nation needs not only men in the vague and popular sense of that word, that is, men who have been taken from the narrow surroundings of somewhat simple homes and who have gone through the process of a sort of miniature world (what I have just called of the unreal world) such as the large college often is; it needs trained and disciplined men, men who know and who can think; men who can perceive and interpret, whose minds are accustomed to difficult tasks and questions, which can not be threaded except by minds used to processes and definite endeavor; men whose faculties are instruments of precision and whose judgments are steady by knowledge. Such men it is not getting by the present processes of college life, and can not get them until that life is organized in a different spirit and for a different purpose." These are beautiful words, and as we read them we can not but appreciate more deeply the complexity of what we ought to do for education. One may doubt and despair if one turns his eyes too earnestly on this dazzling standard. When we contrast the elaborate finish of this ideal product with the intellectual crudity of

the early stages of a boy's life, as we have them, few of us would venture to promise, by any process of our present schooling, to produce such beings as these. Very few such men get born, though such men do appear in the college world oftener than President Wilson will admit. He is such a man himself. He has, therefore, no right to say that such men are not produced at all by our educational processes. What we have to do, we will admit, is to consider more carefully the process of maturing and to improve it if we can. We must find better ways of helping the process of growth in making less the stupidities of youth. We now multiply the children's experiences of life, but we must also deepen them.

We must think with patience of this process and with hope of the result. We produce some good men now; we must produce more of them. Especially we must try to produce more mature men. It is our duty to advance the maturity of young Americans. Yet, on the other hand, in the interests of this maturity, I should say to our critics and to my colleagues, we must stay our haste and make delays. This part of the teacher's duty, to diminish the pace of life for young people, is least understood by American parents, and the American community is, therefore, impatient with us. Much of the school criticism arises simply from undue impatience. Delay in ripening is a very vital part of the ripening process. "Before the beginning of years there came to the making of man time, with the gift of tears." And yet we talk to parents, and college presidents talk to us, as if some teachers' association, some day, would invent a process to eliminate patience and time; as if children could be matured, if we only knew how, in no time at all, as in Paradise.

I recollect hearing once of a process for maturing wine "while you wait." The inventor had figured that contact with the air was the chemical cause of the ripening of wine. As contact could only occur at the surface, consequently, if any way could be found for multiplying the points of contact between the air and the surface of the liquid, the process must be shortened by that factor. His patent or device was to take the wine to the top of a shot tower and spray it downward through the air 400 feet, whereby raw, new port must become fine old wine in the space of about five minutes. Some of our schemes and systems for the economical ripening of youth seem to have the defects of this device, physically and psychologically.

All American life, American ideals, American practices need the slow ripening of time. We must therefore ripen our educational processes, maturing the culture of those who control and plan them. We need a patient attendance, too, on the natural growth of our children. Moreover, our critics need patience in their estimation of our results. A good friend of mine, who sent me into the teaching profession thirty years ago, gave me that watchword as the result of his own successful experience. "You will need patience every day," said he; "you will need courage once a month." I have needed more patience and less courage than that. We all of us have courage enough, especially in challenging the difficulties of our educational task; probably we none of us have patience enough with ourselves and our institutions.

But the unrest of our generation of which I speak is, as a sign of the times, not to be dismissed with a mere recommendation of patience. What does it mean, that for a generation, as Woodrow Wilson said to us last year, "we have been passing through a period when everything seems in the process of dissolution?" When there is such a universal dispersion of every ancient aspect and conception of our world we must examine ourselves. There must be a cause for it. If the new renaissance is due, and perhaps overdue, patience alone will not produce it.

We need something yet to satisfy the longings alike of the hopeful and the despairing who study the educational field. There must be something more looked for to save us. And this one thing needful seems to me to be a better attitude of mind toward work. If one looks more carefully into the mass of criticism of our processes of which I am speaking one feels that they generally reduce to mistrust of the attitude of mind toward work prevailing among teachers or students, or both. As President Wilson said, we are in search of fundamental principles of the thing we are trying to do, and we must be on the eve of a period of reconstruction. Now, there is nothing more fundamental than the attitude of mind with which scholars and teachers attack their common task. It is probably our attitude toward our work as scholars and teachers which we should reconstruct. A search for the best method of doing this ought to reward us, even before we capture any more fundamental principle.

An attitude of mind may determine not only the choice we

make among various ideals of work, but success and failure in reaching them. A new attitude of mind has before now brought about astonishing changes on the face of history. The crusades and all their vast consequences were brought about by an attitude of mind about the Holy Sepulcher. The beliefs and the hopes which accompanied them wrought out fundamental changes in Europe and Asia before they died away. The Reformation was, in the last analysis, a new attitude of mind in European Christianity. Renaissances always spring from intellectual changes, often in a comparatively small class of minds. The great philosophy of evolution which has transformed and is transforming the life of the twentieth century was created by a scientific attitude of mind working out its conclusions in a few laboratories and libraries.

In our own profession the introduction of the elective system was due to a change of mind among a few teachers. All the patient, vigorous work evolved in the establishment of the elective system in the educational institutions of this country during the last generation could never have been carried through had it not been based upon a significant change of mind among a few strong people. Certain people's beliefs about youth and the best experiences of youth in contact with work changed. That change of mind has changed the face of American schooling.

Now, what has happened once may happen again. What might happen if a change of mind as far-reaching as the belief in the elective system should occur again among school teachers? What a difference it would make in our schools and colleges if an attitude of mind should arise among boys toward work, among teachers and parents towards boys and the relation of work to workers, such as has already happened under our eyes in these few years. In what direction, then, shall we look for new forces which may bring about some fresh impulses in the mind of our scholastic youth?

Work, as work, is for some reason not sufficiently respected in American colleges and schools. There is a good deal of evidence that it is less respected in this country even than in the similar institutions in Europe. In the interests of the maturing process which I have said we ought to desire to hasten and increase in school we school teachers and parents should wish somehow to change the attitude of pupils toward their work.

Perhaps we should attempt to change the attitude of the teaching profession also, its present ideals and its present hopes.

Yet the impulse to the new life, the better attitude toward work, if it follows the analogies of other reforms, must probably come from outside the school and college world. Our minds may be subjectively prepared, but the fire must descend from elsewhere. It will not be any attitude of our own minds which we can ourselves create which will produce the new renaissance. Where shall we look for it, then? Whence will come the flash?

Not from our preoccupations with school and college administration. The new renaissance must not be mainly occupied with reforms and readjustments of the apparatus. We have been looking for reform for the last generation in technical improvement of educational processes. There is probably a real danger to us if we go on busying ourselves exclusively with educational machinery. We teachers are prone to think that if we get better apparatus on to the ground all reform is secured; as if, like a fire department, we had to extinguish a blaze instead of creating one. We rely too heavily on our paper schemes. The proverb says that hell is paved with good intentions. If this is ever true it is true of the educational Tartarus. Our hell is paved with school and college catalogues, with "requisitions" and "syllabuses" and other symbols of good intentions never carried out. High-minded idealists that we are, we still labor incessantly at the improvement and enrichment of our apparatus.

Schools are not made without ideals, and ideals can not be enforced without embodiment in personalities. The difficulty of getting great personalities into the teaching profession is undoubtedly one of the causes of exactly the immaturity which we are deploring, of the lack of spontaneous activity in the college classes. I quote Professor Wendell's book again, though I confess my quotations are taken at random and do not represent the main current of his remarks. Mr. Wendell speaks on one page of "personalities with too much vigor to remain content with school teaching." Again, he describes the teaching profession as made up of "scholars and lame ducks," "who keep themselves alive by teaching." If this opinion prevails in America about the teaching profession we can not rely on a great number of superior personalities joining us in our forlorn hope, cer-

tainly not enough to bring about a "New Renaissance," to get a new attitude of mind in the place of the old one by their inspiration. If we are to have among us teachers that produce scholars and lame ducks, the attitude of mind of pupils, teachers and parents to work will never improve.

But I am prepared to say that even if by some miracle a large number of authoritative personalities were to appear in the next generation of school teachers there would still be need of further help to produce the change of heart for which I am looking. There is something further needful than great ideals embodied by great teachers. The saying that Mark Hopkins at one end of the log and a student at the other makes a university is only in one sense true. There must be an atmosphere, an intention, an ambition on both sides of the log, which would hardly be created simply by a dominating personality. We want better reactions on the part of our students themselves, not a reaction excited merely by their interest in attractive people.

While we gladly welcome, therefore, the mystical transfer of life by the living to the living, which Thring described as the true definition of the teacher's activity, there lies even beyond this a more maturing experience still, which every boy and girl must have deep rooted in their lives if they are to be true men and women. Our students must know work.

The hunger for work which comes to every man when he first faces the life struggle, that lonely, competitive personal struggle which we must all know, I shall once for all describe as working for the market. That is the one thing needful to make our schools alive again. Our boys and girls, our young men and women must learn to work by working for the market. This market may be man's market, where one earns one's living, or God's market, where one earns one's salvation. It is this sacramental touch of the spirit of work upon our spirits which we ought to yearn for in the lives of our youth in our secondary schools and colleges. This touch is now, it seems to me, very much wanting. Our boys and girls do not believe they are working for any market at all. If we could persuade the boys and girls in our schools and colleges that they were truly earning their living at school by their work in school we should soon find that our American youth would rise nearer to the measure of their duty in the high schools and colleges. If it could be

seen by pupils that the processes and occupations in the high schools and colleges were in any way concerned with their own marketable value as men we should soon see a renaissance begin. Nothing short of this attitude of mind will really save our schools.

I dislike the words "cultural" and "vocational," but in this connection I feel much tempted to use them. And if I use them I should say that if we wish a new renaissance we must assess the value of our educational institutions in terms of vocation. All pursuits in school should be thought of by the students as vocational pursuits. This will renew our lives. The day one feels that his work is worth more than he is that day the boy becomes a man. I do not say that one must earn dollars or quarters of dollars, necessarily, to acquire that new feeling. When the storm of the Civil War swept over this country a most marvelous change was wrought in many an idle boy. The heroes whose names are inscribed on the walls of our institutions of learning are the names of boys often chiefly distinguished in college by their apathy in all matters of scholastic regimen. Why did they drill in the army who never would drill in college? It was because they saw that their output was marketable in one case and not in the other. It was cultural versus vocational activity. Many are the markets of the universe. They were earning their living who fell at Gettysburg; home they went, and took their wages.

I urge, then, greater consideration and greater esteem for the vocational ideal in school. I think this will work a great change of mind and a greater change of practice. Vocation alone can stimulate Americans to duty. We can not, of course, deny the value of self-culture as a good in itself, nor can we tell our children that anything they do at the age of the secondary school life will be marketable in any very definite vocation. Nothing that our pupils put out, whether it be the solution of a mathematical problem or the acquisition of French or Latin, is as marketable as they are themselves. But though this be the master fact of the adolescent situation, it is not in the least wholesome for such an idea to dominate their imaginations. Cardinal Newman, I believe, laid down the ingenious paradox of ethics, as follows: "Be virtuous and you will be happy. But they that seek happiness have not the virtue." Let me alter it. "Be industrious in school and you will be cultivated. But they that work for

culture never have the right kind of industry. It is only those who work for the product's sake who truly work."

I propose, then, that we should cease to emphasize the cultural ideal of work, as we have done in the past in school and college, and should emphasize the vocational. Culture is not a wholesome ideal for youth. It is in no way a natural ideal for youth; least of all is it so in our generation. Any boy or any girl in our time must work for some social market; the nearer the market the better. It is, for example, because the playing of a football game seems to boys a true vocation that athletics have flourished so largely in the midst of the cultural vacuum, into which Woodrow Wilson describes our teaching as having passed. Can any one conceive, for example, of the hosts which assemble to behold our boys following their "vocation" as athletes assembled to watch cultural exercises in gymnastics. It is the market of competition which enlivens the work of the muscles. Why not of the mind?

Let me repeat. I think that the cultural ideals of the past are not deeply rooted enough in the social life of the present and future to serve the turn of enlisting the best work of American youth. The educational ideal of Athens, for example, on which our ideals of culture generally rest, contemplated an aristocracy whose perfections, mental and bodily, rested upon slave labor and a social ideal of life now outworn. It fails to interest the modern world; our boys misunderstand it. Perfection of the Oxford culture, defined as Professor Jowett described it, teaching "the English gentleman to be an English gentleman," this, too, fails to meet the demand of our time in our country. "A gentleman's mark is 'C,'" was the immortal statement of an ingenuous college youth at Harvard. Why not? But no boy would ever believe that a "C" algebra, offered in any market, was worth more than an "A1" algebra.

In what way can we bring the more wholesome market ideal more closely before the eyes of growing boys and growing girls? In what way can we make the new technical studies serve the test of humanistic ideals, the ideals of work? For this is far more necessary than the reverse. In two ways, it seems to me.

The true market of adult life can be suggested in the work of the earlier years by increasing the number of vocational studies and vocational schools in our community. Let us have trades

taught universally. Let us, even in childhood, learn things which we know even in childhood can be taken to market. Open the trade schools, if we are to have them, to all comers. From them will spread precisely that seriousness about the process, that value in the product, which I desire to see increase in the life of American schoolboys. This will uplift our cultural ideals. Taking the market as it is, even with all its narrowness, let us see that our children get into it earlier than they now do. Let them learn to work with their hands, even though it were hunting and fishing. All the yachting and canoeing and boat-sailing, all the gardening and farming, into which hungry children throw themselves with such avidity, will increase and multiply the centers by which this vivacious ideal of the meaning of work, the true, new attitude of mind may spread.

A second way in which this same end may be reached seems to me important for us American school teachers to consider. Should we not multiply trainings for new vocations in our schools? Why must we narrow our vocational schools to the teaching of trades already at work in the market? Because they see no direct connection between school work and any definitely established trade or profession parents forget that their sons may be called upon to be pioneers in new vocations. We forget that America has to establish new trades and new professions as well as pursue the old ones, and that trade schools alone will not train a man even for the life of trade and commerce. In this connection I should be glad to tell you a story told me by Frederick Law Olmsted of his own beginning and his own experience. He it was who designed and mapped out Central Park, in New York. He told me that when this undertaking first began to be realized he was forced to spend nearly the whole of his days in persuading citizens and officials of New York that they needed a park there. His nights he gave to the professional work involved in making it. So in our work we must cultivate the demand for ourselves as a condition preceding our efforts to satisfy them.

Another thing we can do, if we wish to produce a more inspired industry in our secondary schools, is a thing which is close at hand. We might try to give more of their proper vocational values to such studies as actually exist in the present high school curriculum. We treat all our studies in the high

school and college too often with no regard to their vocational possibilities. We treat them as cultural subjects exclusively and they droop. But all the cultural subjects in our curriculum began originally as vocations. Vocations are older than cultures. Any culture study has more to gain from being true as a vocational study than it has to lose. For instance, it was not until Latin ceased to be of marketable value as a language that it posed as pure culture. But by treating it merely as a culture we are killing it off. Let us now treat it again as vocation. Mr. Wendell suggested that he studied Latin simply as a nauseous means of cultivating the voluntary attention. But why not learn Latin? Why not pursue it as a thing of vocational meaning? It can be done; it ought to be done. It is a language, after all.

Or why not learn some French in our schools? The new method of teaching modern languages has just the vocational meaning. Under the cultural methods of treating the subject one is supposed to value the intellectual culture involved in studying French grammar, rhetoric and literature more than he values the incidental French he acquires. Suppose one postpones all this to the acquisition of a working knowledge of French or German as languages. Would not the attitude of mind in our modern language classes improve? Are they not languages, after all?

Or consider mathematics. Why make that very practical subject so essentially into a setting-up drill of the intellect? Is it necessary to have three years of arithmetical culture, two years of algebraic culture, one year of geometric culture, all separated by logical classification from each other? Is there any good argument for this arrangement? Is there any vocation known in which geometry exists simply as an exercise in logic, independently of arithmetic or algebra?

Or consider the problem of instruction in English. Where would the cultural ideal conduct us finally if we pursued it in the study of English to the exclusion of vocational English entirely? Shall we be able to speak English? We have not made or we have lost too far the vocational connections in our school work.

When I plead for the vocational ideal as a new means of inspiration in our American schools, I am not speaking, of course, solely of the money value of acquisitions or talents. Money values may easily be overestimated, though money value is a pretty faith-

ful index of market value. A boy or girl who receives wages for work feels most vigorously, most strongly, that he is at last enlisted with the colors. It is a great experience, one that I should like every boy and every girl in our country to have, to work for money, as regularly as all European boys serve in the army, if only for two or three years.

But it need not be money values that we propose to consider when we speak of vocational work in school. Much social service is done, and always will be done, which can not be paid for in money. It is sufficient that a boy's work is recognized by the worker and his comrades as service. It may be service to the school, the college, the family, or the community. Work done in the sight of the host has its uplifting inspiration. Why not idealize the word "vocation" and make it appeal in more general ways to our scholars?

If our schools create this vocational atmosphere even in culture studies, great improvements must follow. Two of our greatest problems would probably be solved at once. Under no vocational ideal of school instruction could the absurd proposition maintain itself that every child, in every public school, must study every subject. This superstition sprang out of the old ideal of a rounded culture as the end of school work. This is already a hopeless ideal; it never had any vocational meaning.

Moreover, the other enemy of good work might vanish. If it were understood that the value of the product was to be considered, which each child can present to the world at the close of his school life, we should hear less of overcrowded high schools and overburdened taxpayers. Pupils who could not "make good" from the vocational point of view in pursuing their college and high school subjects, who could not produce any marketable commodity in any subject of learning, necessarily would receive no consideration from the taxpayers. Our democratic indulgence to incompetency in our public schools would be cut at the root.

These random suggestions seem to me to point out the road on which we may march; they do not pretend to be a developed scheme for immediate realization.

We need a new attitude of mind. I think we must search for the new attitude of mind by making our school and college work appeal more and more to the constructive ambition of American youth. James Russell Lowell was fond of saying that school

and college should be the place where "nothing useful was studied." He put it somewhere in another way, that we should respect and provide for the growing of roses, not less than cabbages, in our academic field. No one will deny the deep meaning of these poetic imaginations. Our new attitude of mind can not controvert them; but both roses and cabbages, after all, grow best when grown for the market. I confess, for one, that I think there is more danger in idly contemplating our cabbage field than in attempting to make roses useful. We must interest our boys more in the market values of their intellectual product. This is good modern pragmatism.

We must judge the schools with more severity from the standpoint of public market. Things are tolerated good-naturedly in American schools which would not be tolerated in Europe, where market values are more considered. We are too gentle, for example, with bad English if produced in school by a nice boy. The one thing needful is a new and severer attitude of mind, which would arrive automatically among both pupils and teachers if vocational ideals should be more considered, even at the expense of the cultural atmosphere.

As this convention is now housed in a church, I hope it will be permitted me to remind my audience of the New Testament story from which we have derived our phrase, "The one thing needful." The rich young man asked the Master what he must do to be saved. He rehearsed his great possessions and detailed his culture. But the answer was, "Sell all that thou hast." Does this not mean to take all that we have to market? This application of the parable is not fanciful, I think. It is good Christianity. Here shortly follows another parable which proves this. At the Day of Judgment, we are told, one set of mankind will appear before the bar of heaven, appealing to their cultural experiences. "Lord, we have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and Thou hast taught in our streets." They have been in the presence of great things and great men; they have seen them idly; they have passed by. We are also told that they will be judged by a vocational test: Have they done anything "for the least of these my brethren?" And those who have only eaten and drunk in the presence of the Lord, who have never brought their talents to the market test, will be invited to depart with the other children of selfish culture to the place where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth.

Vocation is a word to conjure with in modern America. I want to use it, with its associations, to cover the whole ground of a boy's experience in his school life. I want it to bring about a new attitude in work. Do not mistake me. I have no desire to make radical substitutions, say of laundry work for Latin. I do not wish the higher experiences of the soul to give way to the lower. But high or low are dangerous words to use of human education. Let the rose follow the vocation of the rose, and the cabbage of the cabbage; they are both in honor. Good laundry work well done is higher than bad Latin. Even for the cultural studies one may desire to win the connotations of the word vocational. There is no telling by what lowly door the Lord of Life may enter in.

Let us persuade our students to take their talents and their culture always in the spirit of service. Let us so teach them how to work and why to work and what work is, from the market point of view. That is the one thing needful, I think, to fill again the idle sails of American schools and colleges.

FOURTH SESSION

Saturday, November 28, at 10 A. M.

THE PRESIDENT.—The first business on the program is the Report of the Committee on the Establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board, of which Professor Edwin S. Crawley, of the University of Pennsylvania, is Chairman.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COLLEGE ENTRANCE CERTIFICATE BOARD.

PROFESSOR EDWIN S. CRAWLEY, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

To the President and Members of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland:

Ladies and Gentlemen.—The question of the establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board for the Middle States and Maryland first came before this Association at the meeting in 1906 in the form of a recommendation from the Williamstown Conference of the summer before. A committee was then appointed to look into the matter and to report at the next meeting. This committee made a report in 1907, recommending the formation of such a board. A new committee was then appointed to carry out this recommendation, and it is the report of that committee which I present.

The committee of 1906 had made inquiry of all the colleges and schools having membership in the Association as to their attitude toward the formation of a College Entrance Certificate Board, and had found that a very large majority favored it. The present committee issued a call for a meeting to all the colleges in the Association, and to the five secondary school delegates who had been appointed by the President of the Association, to be held in Philadelphia May 9, 1908. This meeting was attended by delegates from the following colleges:

Adelphi College,
Albright College,
Colgate University,
Cornell University,
Delaware College,
Dickinson College,
Franklin and Marshall College,
Haverford College,

Hobart College,
Johns Hopkins University,
Lehigh University,
Pennsylvania State College,
Rutgers College,
St. John's College,
St. Stephen's College,
Temple College,
Union College,
University of Pennsylvania,
University of Rochester,
Vassar College,
Washington & Jefferson College,
George Washington University,
Wells College,

and by Messrs. W. W. Birdsall and James M. Green, of the secondary school delegates.

President Rhees, University of Rochester, occupied the chair.

This conference held two sessions, one in the morning and one in the afternoon. A constitution was drawn up and adopted tentatively, and the meeting adjourned without day, after appointing a committee of seven, who were charged with the duty of drawing up a set of rules of procedure for the proposed board, and of calling another meeting early in the present autumn. This committee of seven held a meeting on June 6, at which a set of rules was formulated. The constitution and rules were printed and copies sent to all who participated in the conference of May 9, to the other colleges which had expressed interest in the matter but had not been represented at the meeting, and to the three secondary school delegates who had not been able to attend.

Under date of September 30, the same committee sent out a call for a meeting in Philadelphia on November 14. The meeting was attended by delegates from the following colleges:

Colgate University,
Cornell University,
Dickinson College,
Hobart College,
Johns Hopkins University,
Lehigh University,
Muhlenberg College,
New York University,
Pennsylvania College,
Pennsylvania State College,
Rutgers College,
St. John's College,
St. Stephen's College,
Swarthmore College,
Temple College,
Union College,
University of Pennsylvania,
University of Rochester,
Vassar College,
George Washington University,
Wells College,
Woman's College, Baltimore,

and by Mr. Gunnison, of the secondary school delegates.

Chancellor McCracken, New York University, occupied the chair.

The constitution previously adopted and the rules which the committee had drawn up were considered in detail and revised in some respects. A copy of the constitution and rules as adopted by the conference of November 14 is submitted as a part of this report. Before adjournment the conference passed a resolution referring the revised constitution and rules back to the colleges, with the understanding that as soon as they shall have been ratified by not less than fifteen (15) colleges another meeting will be called and the board regularly organized. A committee of three was appointed with authority to call this meeting as soon as the necessary number of ratifications shall have been received. As this report shows, further procedure toward the definite establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board is now in the hands of the colleges concerned. Your committee would conclude its work, therefore, by recommending that the President of this Association appoint at once six secondary school principals to serve on the board, three to serve for one year and three for two years. By making these appointments now there need be no delay on this account in putting the business of the board into operation as soon as the required number of colleges have ratified the constitution and rules.

THE PRESIDENT.—You have heard the report of the committee. It lies before the meeting for discussion. General discussion on the report of the committee which has reported the establishment of the College Entrance Certificate Board is now in order.

PRESIDENT FELL, ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE.—I move that the report be adopted.

Mr. W. N. Marcy seconded the motion.

THE PRESIDENT.—It is moved and seconded that the report of our committee presented by Professor Crawley on the establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board be adopted by this Association. As many as are in favor of the adoption of this report as given please say "Aye;" contrary minded, "No." It is a unanimous vote. The report of the committee is adopted.

I think, before passing to the next subject, as this is not only

a business meeting, but also a meeting for the informal exchange of ideas, I will ask if any one has any questions to ask of Professor Crawley, of an informal character, on the report, or on the meeting which has sent in this report, or on the general subject. Last year there was a good deal of general discussion on the merits of the question; but it was decided last year (I think properly) that we had to go forward—that the committee must be appointed (and it was appointed) for the establishment of this certificate board. I felt, however, at the time—and I dare say some of you felt—that we were not very well informed yet as to what the committee propose to do—what action, if any, they propose to take. This seems to be an opportunity, now, for any questions that may occur.

PROFESSOR THOMAS S. FISKE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—I have been away for some time and have lost track, to some extent, of the details of the scheme; but on page 5 of this circular, Rule 7, I read: "All schools unconditionally approved shall continue on this list indefinitely," which will result in their being no necessity of renewal of application for approval. I should like to inquire whether this rule is similar to a rule adopted by the New England Certicate Board, or whether this is peculiar to the proposed board of the Middle States and Maryland.

PROFESSOR EDWIN S. CRAWLEY.—The rule of the New England board is, that no school remains automatically on the approved list for more than three years. At the end of the period of three years the school must itself renew its application. Our committee thought that so long as a school's record is satisfactory, as shown by the standing maintained by the students whom it sends to college upon certificate, it is useless to go through the form of removing it from the list periodically and then reinstating it. The board will make, every three years, however, specific inquiries of each school on the list, similar to those made at the time of its application for approval.

PROFESSOR THOMAS S. FISKE.—Then there is a difference, in that the New England school must every three years demonstrate its eligibility to remain in membership; whereas, the Middle States school will continue indefinitely, unless its condition shall have

become notorious, we may say, and it shall have been expelled. In one case the school must be expelled, and then perhaps at some later period it can be readmitted; but in New England the school must demonstrate every three years that it is in good standing, in the same way as when it was first admitted.

PRINCIPAL H. W. DUTCH, MONTCLAIR HIGH SCHOOL.—I would like to ask the chairman of this committee if the committee's plan comprehends at all any systematic visiting or inspection of the schools that are on the approved list by officers or instructors in the different colleges represented.

PROFESSOR EDWIN S. CRAWLEY.—That was a question which the committee and the conference both considered at considerable length, and decided that it was impracticable to institute, at present at any rate, any regular system of inspection; that the judgment as to each school will have to depend largely upon the records made in college by the students sent to college upon certificate from the school.

PRINCIPAL H. W. DUTCH.—Do I understand that the committee feels that such a system of inspection is impracticable?

PROFESSOR EDWIN S. CRAWLEY.—Yes, principally on account of the great expense that would necessarily be involved.

PRINCIPAL H. W. DUTCH.—On page 4, division (e), "The general 'tone' of the school, so far as it may be possible to determine it." It certainly is a matter of importance to the board to know what the character and general tone of a school may be. How was that to be ascertained? Simply through the statement of the principal?

PROFESSOR JULIUS SACHS, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.—The point made by the previous speaker is the one that prompted some of the members at the meeting last year to evince some opposition to the creation of this College Certificate Board by the Middle States Association. It did seem to some of us that the vital point was to get an insight into the working of the school—not such an insight as appears from the incidental performance of a

few students at college, but a fuller view of a school in operation. And it seems to me that that objection has not been removed by the method of procedure indicated here. But in addition to that, it is fair to ask the question—Has the committee in any way determined definitely how it proposes to consider those several points on page 4: (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), and (f)? We hear that they are going to give consideration to those points; what degree of consideration? How is that to be measured? Courses of study maintained; character and equipment and efficiency in the teaching staff; and proportion of teachers? Has a norm been established, or is it a matter to be left, in each individual case, to the judgment of the board, which undoubtedly will be exercised with great conscientiousness? On the other hand, whether it would not be well to fix, definitely, standards, and have every school know that it must live up to those standards, otherwise it is likely to be found short of the requirement? If those are matters to be determined individually and incidentally, they may change from year to year; three secondary school men (that is, half of those appointed) will change; the representatives of the colleges will change from year to year; and a very stringent exercise of supervision in one year may be followed in succeeding years by a lax supervision.

If I understand this movement correctly, it is to enforce thorough work; to help in building up the secondary school work—the grades in the secondary school work. Unless some definite plan has been conceived by the committee, which does not appear in these statements, it is not likely that that will be secured and guarded very uniformly from year to year.

President Thomas Fell, St. John's College.—Having been one of those who attended the various conferences, I may say that most of the questions that have just been raised were brought before our attention and discussed on those occasions.

It appeared to the Conference Committee that it was impossible to lay down any definite course of action for the Certificate Board.

By referring to paragraph III, on page 2 of the constitution, it will be seen that the date when the rules become operative has been postponed until September, 1911, as it was believed that in the interim the Executive Committee would be able to get to-

gether and develop the plans of procedure, in accordance with the experience they might have gained. That then they would have something of a definite character to submit for our consideration.

It seems to me that if any of the small colleges, governed as they are by local conditions, were to enroll themselves as members of the board, they would have to do so tentatively, with the understanding that if the conditions as mapped out eventually by the committee of the board are not satisfactory to them, they would be at liberty to withdraw.

I think, therefore, it is not within the scope of this Association to attempt to outline any course of action until the committee of the Certificate Board has had some practical experience and laid before us the definite plans which it advises us to adopt.

THE PRESIDENT.—As far as I am responsible for this discussion, I do not understand that this Association has the power or the wish now to accept or refuse this constitution, which is a constitution made by the Certificate Board itself. We are engaged, as I understand it, only in an informal discussion for the benefit of Professor Crawley and other members of the committee who are here. The committee's work is as yet not fully complete, and therefore I shall be very glad to hear everybody's recommendations on this floor. It will be duly passed over to the board and be entertained by them.

In answer to Dr. Fell, I have heard nothing to indicate that any college will not be free to retire in 1911 from participation in the benefits of this Certificate Board. It would be very absurd for us to try to bind colleges which refuse to belong to the Association.

We are all within earshot of the President, the committee has reported to this body that the board is to be established under this constitution, and the board will actually settle all the questions we are now discussing. Meanwhile we are merely questioning the future doings of the board.

PROFESSOR LOUIS BEVIER, JR., RUTGERS COLLEGE.—It seems to me that an informal discussion of this kind is of the utmost importance, because, necessarily, much in the policy of the board, when established, has been as yet left undetermined. The committee

of which Professor Crawley is chairman has endeavored to outline a constitution and a few simple rules that seem capable of practical working, leaving the details largely to be determined by the board itself, when it shall be constituted, and by its Executive Committee, when that shall have been chosen. Two or three points have been raised which the committee has considered, and to which Professor Crawley has briefly replied. Perhaps a word might be added: In regard to the automatic dropping of a school no word has been said. In regard to the periodic examination of the actual conditions which exist in any school no word has perhaps been adequately said. The fact that every school's record is in a sense to be tested each year should, of course, be emphasized. Now, inasmuch as this constitution requires from all the participating colleges a report at the end of the first unit of college work (a term or a semester) of the record of all the students received by certificate, there is a sort of check at once. There is, besides that, the provision that the failure to use the privilege of certification automatically drops a school from the approved list. The fundamental matter, the matter about which debate may properly rage, is the question of how the certificate list is to be in the first place determined, and in the second place revised from year to year.

Two plans are possible. The one is the plan of depending upon written reports received from the schools stating, from their own viewpoint, what they are doing, what they can do, and what they propose to do, what courses, entrance requirements, and what teaching staff they have, what are the qualifications of the teaching staff, what apparatus is provided, what the tone of the school is. Appropriate blanks for securing this information Professor Crawley has, no doubt, in his mind and could draw in diagram if there were a blackboard here. When these claims are tested by reports from the receiving colleges, we have the elements of one plan. That puts the onus squarely upon results as shown in the first months of the college course; and a school will maintain its place, or lose its place, according to the record of the students entering by certificate into the participating colleges.

Another plan, which has its advocates, is in practice in the West, but not in the East, *i. e.*, an elaborate scheme of inspection of the schools demanding a place upon the approved list.

Now, we all know that a school is to be tested finally by the results seen in its actual operation; but any who have given thought to it, and certainly any who have had practice in school inspection, know that the force of inspectors requisite to do this work in the territory of the Middle States and Maryland, in a way that would be helpful, would have to be very large. I scarcely like to mention numbers. I am afraid it would seem extravagant if I told you what I really think. It would certainly be so large a force as to be utterly out of the question, in the judgment of the committee, at the present time. Moreover, it is the duty of the States in this territory themselves to do this work for the public high schools. It is already attempted in several of these States, and will be done with increasing thoroughness. And it seemed to the committee that the only practical way to start the Certificate Board would be frankly to adopt the basis of the New England Board in spite of its obvious limitations.

One fact is apparent to us all. If fifteen or more colleges in the Middle States and Maryland decide to come together and form this board, their co-operation will certainly be a valuable educational advance, even if it does not solve the problems that we have before us. It will be a contribution toward a better regulation of this certificating privilege, which has, in some cases in the past, amounted to an abuse.

PROFESSOR A. E. GOBBLE, ALBRIGHT COLLEGE.—There is another question with reference to the preparatory schools, and what was just said brought it into my mind. The preparatory school from which I had the honor to enter Franklin and Marshall College would probably not make much of a show if the professors of Columbia or the University of Pennsylvania would look over the list of questions that that little academy could answer, as far as equipment, etc., is concerned; and yet I know that there is not a college in the central part of Pennsylvania that would ever think of refusing to accept on its papers, I believe, students prepared for college at Professor Hosterman's school at Spring Mills. I know they have entered most of the colleges of Central Pennsylvania, and that little academy stands well in the eyes of the people who know it; but if you want to put the standing of that school on paper in cold figures that can be looked at with respect, so that it may be received into the list of

schools certifying to pupils for entrance into the colleges from a university standpoint, I don't think it would stand a chance at all. But as chairman of that committee in the college to which I belong, I should say at once, if a certificate would come from my old chum: "Let him come in." I would not want to turn any of his boys down, because I know that if he prepared any of his boys for college, they are well prepared; and yet that is a little institution. It is an academy during the summer months, and during the winter months it is a grammar school. We would not like to say that we would accept the certificate from a grammar school unless we knew the work of it; but you can not judge the working of it as you would a school with a hundred thousand dollars endowment back of it—or if you put a lot of apparatus into it. The boys coming from schools of the smaller kind, schools whose working we know because we are acquainted with the men who teach there, we have known before they came to those schools to prepare for college. Many times we have known those boys for years and known just exactly what they were doing from year to year before they made application; and for that reason we would like to get such schools as that on the list, although, as far as cold figures are concerned, I don't suppose they would be received.

Professor Louis Bevier, Jr.—Pardon me if I add one word more which the discussion seems to render necessary. The territory over which this board is to have its eye in the selection of schools is very diverse in the condition of secondary education; and it is quite possible that a number of colleges are situated so that they ought not to become members of such a board at the present time. Where the secondary school system, particularly the public secondary school system, is still undeveloped, where free opportunity to attend a well-equipped secondary school is not within the reach of every boy, it scarcely seems to me possible for an institution to join this Board at the present time. There is a profound truth in the words of the last speaker, as I am sure all practical educators must know that some of the very best material that comes to the college is material irregularly prepared in schools where the personal quality of the headmaster or of some one teacher dominates the entire school life. We

have all seen such cases. This board, however, is to be a voluntary association of those institutions whose circumstances and surroundings do allow co-operation in this way. It is of importance to both college and secondary school, because it will tend to bring about a better development of secondary education where it is still in a chaotic and undeveloped state.

PROFESSOR ROBERT B. ENGLISH, WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE.—In view of what has just been said, we are very anxious to determine, for our own enlightenment, what the position of a college like ours would be in the proposed plan of the Certificate Board. Washington and Jefferson, as you know, is located in the southwestern part of the State of Pennsylvania. A large percentage of our students come from Eastern Ohio, from Western Pennsylvania, and from West Virginia. And it must be said that some of the preparatory schools in this section are among the best that are to be found anywhere and some of them are not. In the matter of admitting students to college we have a complicated situation to meet. Our present plan is to admit tentatively by certificate from all the schools covering the work which we require for admission; but this is a temporary admission only. The certificate is interpreted to be presumptive evidence that the student is prepared for college. At the expiration of six weeks, every candidate is examined thoroughly in every department on the work which he has done in the college during these six weeks. It then remains in our judgment whether he is qualified to carry the work or not. If, in our judgment, he is not qualified to carry the work, he is remanded to the preparatory school. If he is qualified we take him in and give him all the aid we can. Our system, as you see, is a combination of two: it admits by certificate and by examination; the examination is not, however, on preparatory work, but it is on the work done in the college after the boy has been tentatively admitted. In becoming identified with this Board we would not like to surrender this method of admitting students, because we have found that it is a very satisfactory method. I would like to ask for information what, in the judgment of the chairman of the committee, our position would be relative to the proposed plan of the board.

PROFESSOR EDWIN S. CRAWLEY.—That is a difficult question to answer. I should think that perhaps you might save yourself the trouble of the six weeks' drill and move your examination up to the beginning of the year in the case of doubtful candidates.

PROFESSOR R. B. ENGLISH.—Our present method has resulted from the differences in the location and the differences in the quality of the schools sending students to us. To examine all prospective freshmen at the opening of the year, or at the commencement week of the previous year, did not seem to us satisfactory. It was tried for some years. I regret that Dr. Moffat could not be present at this session to represent the college, but I have conferred with him frequently on this subject, and I am sure that at Washington and Jefferson we all feel that the system we have adopted is the most satisfactory system we can at present formulate for that part of the country. We are anxious to cooperate for the benefit of all the schools sending students to the college, and we do not want to take any step that would forestall our object, or that would put us in a position where we could not accomplish what we want to do. I am frank to state what I have said because we are thoroughly in sympathy with the movement represented by this board.

HEADMASTER WILSON FARRAND, NEWARK ACADEMY.—I should like to ask whether the position of Washington and Jefferson is not that, practically, of every college that admits on certificate. They all admit, or pretend to admit, every student coming in on certificate, on probation, and profess to drop him at once—that is, in six weeks or three months—if he does not maintain his position. It would seem to me that on that basis Washington and Jefferson was distinctly a certificate-admitting college.

PROFESSOR R. B. ENGLISH.—I think we differ from many institutions in that we examine all candidates for the freshman class and only such candidates at the expiration of six weeks. All students in all classes are examined at the end of each semester. If a student fails in any part of his work at the semestral examination he must satisfy the requirements of the institution respecting such failure in order to maintain his position. But our sole aim and purpose in holding the examination at the end of six

weeks is to determine whether the candidate can continue a course in college or must spend more time in securing a better preparation. It has been our common experience that these men on probation do quite as good work in the first six weeks as any students are doing at the same time anywhere in the institution.

THE PRESIDENT.—Ladies and Gentlemen, these are matters of great general interest, and, I suppose, will be conveyed to the board by your delegates who are to be appointed. Are there any further hints or suggestions or expressions of feeling or definite proposals that anybody in this meeting would like to convey to the College Entrance Certificate Board, when established, in which this Association takes a certain part?

The morning is passing, and we have another interesting subject, the "Report of the Committee of Twelve on the Quantity of College Entrance Examinations." The report is to be presented by Headmaster Wilson Farrand, of Newark Academy. I will ask Mr. Farrand to please come forward and read it.

COMMITTEE ON QUANTITY OF COLLEGE ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS.

PRESENTED BY HEADMASTER WILSON FARRAND, NEWARK ACADEMY.

Your committee, composed of six college officers and six representatives of schools, appointed at the last meeting to consider the whole question of the quantity of college entrance requirements, begs leave to report as follows:

We have met and have discussed the subject as thoroughly as the time at our disposal would allow. We have found the subject a broad one, involving much detail and many points that call for careful investigation before an authoritative judgment can be pronounced on them. Some of these, as, for example, the question as to what should constitute a point or unit, and the whole question of the establishment of a scale of values for the measurement of entrance requirements, are at present under consideration by other bodies, and definite reports on them may be expected in the near future. We confine our report to the statement of a few definite principles on which our opinion is unanimous, and which we regard as thoroughly established.

As a preliminary statement we wish to say emphatically that in our judgment *the only ground on which a reduction of the quantity of college entrance requirements can justly be urged is that of an improvement in the quality of the work done in preparation for them.* The excessive amount of time and attention given by secondary school students of late years to athletics, fraternities, and social life is a distinct interference with efficient school work, and we do not believe that this is a valid reason for lightening the pupils' labors. It is a fact, however, that the ground to be covered in preparation for college has been greatly extended during recent years, until we have reached a condition where the work is not being satisfactorily accomplished; in other words, the increase in quantity has involved a sacrifice of quality. The standpoint from which we have viewed the question is not that of seeking to lighten the pupils' labors, but of striving to improve the quality of the work done. The question to be answered is whether the quantity of college entrance requirements has become too great to be covered properly in the schools. We

do not at this time attempt a final or complete answer to the question. We leave many topics for future consideration, such, for example, as the fourteen-point standard and related questions, and we express opinions only on points which we have carefully considered, and in regard to which there is no doubt in our minds.

1. The first principle that we wish to assert is that the amount of work that may reasonably be demanded for admission to college is measured by what can be done in an efficient four-year high school course, following an elementary school course of (say) eight years. This is not to assert that the ideal plan is that of a four-year high school course. The plan of a five or six-year course, such as exists in some private schools and is urged by high authorities as desirable for our public school system, appears to possess some distinct advantages. The four-year course, however, is the standard at present, and any increase in college requirements beyond what can be accomplished in these schools must mean either the confining of college preparation to a separate class of fitting schools, or the covering of the necessary ground in the regular schools in a superficial and unsatisfactory manner. Neither result is to be desired. We believe that the question of beginning the high school course earlier should be most carefully considered, and we have no doubt that if the plan proves feasible it will lighten the pressure that now exists in college preparation and at the same time will improve the quality of the work done. But even if such a plan were at once put in force it would be five or six years before it produced results, and we are concerned with the present situation. As things stand now, any demands on the part of the colleges that are in excess of what can be accomplished in good and efficient high schools must lead either to a breach between the schools and the colleges or to superficial work in college preparation, and are, therefore, to be deplored.

2. In the second place, we call attention to the fact that the number of subjects required for admission to college has been steadily increased during the last forty years. Then the requirements consisted of Latin, Greek, and a small amount of mathematics. Since then not only has the number of subjects called for in most of our colleges been increased, but also the ground to be covered. As instances, we may mention the present requirements in English, geometry, and the modern languages. In our

judgment better results would be secured in preparation for college if the same amount of work were concentrated upon fewer subjects.

3. Our third position is that the minor differences now existing between colleges in the matter of entrance requirements are detrimental to the best interests of education and should be eliminated. This hardly seems to require argument. When a school is compelled to divide its classes into sections according to the colleges its students wish to enter, or when a class is compelled to cover a greater amount of ground in order to meet the requirements of different colleges, the efficiency of the school and the thoroughness of the work done are certain to suffer. Few schools are so equipped that they can meet these varying demands without a distinct sacrifice of efficiency and without an undue and unnecessary increase of expense. To secure more thorough preparation, our colleges should eliminate these minor differences and agree upon an identical statement of requirements in the different subjects. Some progress has been made of late years in removing these differences, but they still exist to such an extent that the unity of the student's course is greatly impaired.

4. Serious criticisms have been made as to the character and scope of the requirements in certain subjects, as, for example, in physics, geometry, history, and English. In our judgment these criticisms are serious enough to call for the careful reconsideration of such requirements by properly constituted committees. These committees should consist, on the part of the colleges, of specialists in the subjects concerned, and, on the part of the schools, of headmasters, who know the claims of other subjects, and can measure the demands made upon the students by the total amount of entrance requirements.

As stated in the first part of this report, we do not offer a final answer to the questions submitted to us, but express opinions only on those points that we have been able to consider adequately. Several important matters remain that are worthy of most careful investigation. Among these we mention especially the satisfactory measurement of the quantity of college entrance requirements in terms of school work. This involves agreement upon a unit of measurement and the establishment of a scale of values by which any particular requirement or set of requirements can be measured. The Carnegie Foundation, which is rapidly be-

coming one of the potent educational forces of the country, has established such a scale to aid it in its own work and is now co-operating with the College Entrance Examination Board and other agencies in the attempt to perfect a scheme of measurement which may be generally accepted. The establishment and general acceptance of such a scale of values will be a distinct assistance in the consideration of such questions as those now before us. In this connection we commend for careful consideration the plan that has been suggested of forming an authoritative commission to investigate thoroughly and to report upon the amount of work that we may reasonably expect to be done in our schools; for what the colleges may reasonably demand can only be fairly measured by what the schools can adequately supply.

We may also record the fact that the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools a year ago appointed a committee similar to our own to consider the same question. At the recent meeting of the Association this committee made a report of progress, emphasizing especially the differences in the requirements of different colleges, and will continue its investigations for another year.

To recapitulate, our four resolutions are as follows:

1. The amount of work that may be demanded for admission to college is measured by what can be done in an efficient four-year high school course.

2. In our judgment, better results would be secured in preparation for college if the same amount of work were concentrated on fewer subjects.

3. The minor differences now existing between colleges in the matter of entrance requirements are detrimental to the best interests of education and should be eliminated.

4. In our judgment, criticisms on special subjects are serious enough to call for the careful reconsideration of such requirements by properly constituted committees.

Respectfully submitted,

WILSON FARRAND,
Newark Academy, Chairman.

HERMAN V. AMES,
University of Pennsylvania.

GEORGE P. BRISTOL,
Cornell University.

GEORGE R. CARPENTER,
Columbia University.
IRA REMSEN,
Johns Hopkins University.
JAMES M. TAYLOR,
Vassar College.
HENRY D. THOMPSON,
Princeton University.
JULIUS SACHS,
Teachers' College.
EDWARD J. GOODWIN,
Packer Institute, Brooklyn.
DAVID A. KENNEDY,
Dearborn-Morgan School, Orange.
WALTER R. MARSH,
St. Paul's School, Garden City.
WILLIAM L. SAYRE,
Central Manual Training High School, Philadelphia.

THE PRESIDENT.—The report of this committee is before the meeting for action. It is moved that the report of the committee be accepted and adopted. As many as are in favor of the adoption of this report please say "Aye;" those opposed, "No." It is adopted.

PROFESSOR LOUIS BEVIER, JR.—I move that the committee be continued for one year to complete its work.

THE PRESIDENT.—It is moved and seconded that this committee be continued for one year to continue its work. As many as are in favor will please say "Aye;" contrary minded, "No;" it is a vote. The committee, then, stands with the same membership, continued for another year.

It seems to me it might be well to open the report of this committee for general discussion—not for the same reason, quite, but because this subject is really so near and dear to us all. This is the enemy—the overcrowding of the curriculum in the work of the secondary school, quantitative excesses, the fatty degeneration of our secondary school work. I shall hope that those who feel inspired (as we all do) will say something about it.

PROF. LOUIS BEVIER, JR.—I rise simply to ask a question: What measures would Mr. Farrand suggest for the study of the particular entrance requirements which he singles out as needing revision? Is there any additional machinery that ought to be set in motion?

HEADMASTER WILSON FARRAND.—There is plenty of machinery; the trouble is to get it working without conflict. The organization of such committees as has been suggested is a difficult and complicated matter. They must, in the first place, be broad in their scope. Any committee that is going to make definite recommendations in regard to the requirements in Latin or in English must represent the whole country, and not one particular section. In the next place, it must be representative of the different interests concerned, of the different colleges and different kinds of colleges, of the different schools and different classes of schools. How to secure the appointment of such committees is an extremely delicate and difficult matter. There is no body in existence that can simply say, "Thus shall a committee be constituted." The College Entrance Examination Board has in certain subjects undertaken part of the work, or, at least, has undertaken the initiative, and it has found itself in very troubled waters. There has recently been at work a commission on the subject of physics, and the question of how to secure the appointment of a committee that should be representative was a very troublesome one. Those of us who were engineering the matter found all sorts of difficulties. When we finally thought that we had found a satisfactory plan, and had carried it out, we were told that the result was that the committee was entirely unrepresentative. The general plan adopted was that this and the other Associations of Colleges and Preparatory Schools should each appoint delegates representing both the colleges and the schools, and that, if possible, the national learned Associations should appoint a certain number of representatives. By learned Associations I mean such organizations as the American Historical Association and the Modern Language Association. We have found, however, that there is no one plan that can be adopted that will answer in regard to all subjects. For example, the American Physical Society, if that is the title, declined to appoint repre-

sentatives, because it said that it had no interest in the teaching of elementary physics. It was interested in the subject itself, and in extending the domain of physical knowledge. I am simply indicating to you some of the difficulties that arise. There is no plan that can be followed in all cases; it has to be modified according to the necessities of the particular case.

PROFESSOR JULIUS SACHS.—I think I am voicing the opinion of some of the other members; I should like to hear from some of the colleges that are represented here today, how they feel with respect to the one point on which the committee have laid considerable emphasis. It would be greatly to the interests of all concerned if the minor variations in statement of entrance requirements were removed by the adoption of identical statements on the part of the various colleges.

To us, that seems a matter of supreme importance; but we could not insist upon it. It is for the college presidents to say whether such a matter is feasible, and whether it would in any way defeat the special objects of the college in formulating its requirements. It is a matter of extreme importance to the progress of this question.

PROFESSOR MURRAY P. BRUSH, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.—A year or two ago a committee of the Johns Hopkins Faculty in charge of undergraduate work took up this question of entrance examinations and what should be required of the men who were coming in. The members of this committee investigated the question very thoroughly and went over the entrance requirements of a great many colleges; then we tried to pick out requirements which should correspond in the main, or be an average requirement, for most of the colleges in the country. Those requirements were then fixed in terms of hours or of pages of work in language, and of certain amounts of other subjects, so that the schools preparing for one college would not have to change their courses to prepare for the Johns Hopkins. In making up these entrance requirements, it did not seem to be a very difficult matter to allow certain substitutions; the head of the Latin department, for instance, wanted the men to have read about so much Latin, and he did not care especially whether they had read Cæsar, Cicero, and Virgil, or whether they had read some Livy and some

Ovid and other things, but he did want a certain ability, so he required so many pages. The same thing is true in the modern languages. In mathematics the requirements are more generally fixed. I think if the colleges in general could make their entrance requirements a little more elastic, so that the preparatory schools could prepare a certain amount of a subject, without being required to prepare any particular texts (I speak from the standpoint of a language man), that this question would naturally solve itself. I do not think there would be any great difficulty in preparing students to pass examinations on certain points of the different subjects, and if the requirements were confined to the regular, old-time subjects, we might say, of Latin, mathematics, Greek or the modern languages, and English, then a certificate in other subjects might be required, I mean a certificate that they had been studied might be required, but it would not be necessary for the candidate to pass an examination in them. That is, the preparatory schools would be at liberty to teach the natural sciences or their modern languages as they pleased. It really seems, after all, as if Latin, mathematics and English are the backbone of the preparatory instruction and all that should be absolutely required for matriculation.

PROFESSOR SPENCER TROTTER, SWARTHMORE COLLEGE.—The remarks that have been made in regard to the elimination of a number of the studies required for entrance at college, appeal to me very strongly and, I think, to a good many, in the line of science. I much prefer to take students who have no knowledge of physiology whatever, as gained in the Preparatory Schools, and not worry along with students who have been *supposedly* prepared in physiology for entrance.

The same is true of zoology, in large measure, though I am speaking now especially of physiology. I think we can do better in college with students who have had little if any preliminary training in the study of physiology by carrying them along, say the first three months in preliminaries, and then cutting deeper into the subject along the lines of higher work. I have found repeatedly in my experience with students, especially in physiology, that the problem is to get the students into a deeper understanding of the subject at the beginning. When they come "prepared" from schools they don't seem to have that clear understanding of

the subject that will lead them on in a short time to take up the deeper problems. The same is true, I think, of physics. I have talked with our professor at Swarthmore, who holds much the same view. We prefer to start the students raw, without any knowledge whatever—any preliminary knowledge. We all know, in this State at least, how a beautiful study has been ruined by its stalking-horse qualities on the temperance question.

PROFESSOR C. W. PRETTYMAN, DICKINSON COLLEGE.—I think Dr. Sachs has not yet been answered. I wish to answer the question which he asked of the colleges—whether they would like a definite entrance requirement in specific subjects. My own subject is German. I shall, as a member of the college Faculty, welcome a very definite and specific requirement laid down by some one in authority. Having to face this problem every year, I shall be very glad of a specific requirement laid down by some such board as is here suggested this morning.

THE PRESIDENT.—Seventy-five per cent. of all the teachers in this country are women; and 99½ per cent. of all the good teachers are women. Would not some woman like to speak? The Association has only one more piece of business, but it is nearly half an hour ahead of time. I will, however, close this part of the session and proceed to the Business meeting.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS.

First Session, Friday, November 27th.

The president appointed the following temporary committees:

On Nominations: President John H. Harris, Bucknell University; Director James C. Mackenzie, Mackenzie School; Principal W. R. Crabbe, Shady Side Academy; Superintendent Randall Spaulding, Montclair, N. J.; Headmaster Frederick Gardiner, Yeates School.

On Audit: President James D. Moffatt, Washington and Jefferson College; Professor George P. Bristol, Cornell University.

Fourth Session, Saturday, November 28th.

PROF. GEORGE P. BRISTOL, Cornell University: I move that the thanks of this Association be extended to the authorities of Franklin and Marshall College for the very kind and generous hospitality which they have so fully bestowed upon us.

The motion was carried.

TREASURER'S REPORT.

DR. JOHN B. KIEFFER, Treasurer, read his report, as follows:

To the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland:

GENTLEMEN: I present herewith my report of the condition of the treasury of your Association for the year 1907-08, as embodied in the accompanying statement of receipts and disbursements, with the necessary vouchers.

The receipts for the year amounted to $1,485.37, and the disbursements to $1,011.83, leaving in my hands today a balance of $473.54, to which will be added, in January next, on the certificate of deposit in the Farmers Trust Company, of Lancaster, Pa., of $400, the sum of $14 making the entire amount of balance in my hands for the coming year $487.54. The expenses of the Association again somewhat exceeded the income from membership dues, so that this balance is $117.83 less than the balance reported last year.

I append a summary of receipts and disbursements, as follows:

RECEIPTS.

Balance on hand November 29, 1907	$587 87
Interest on certificate of deposit	17 50
Membership dues for 1905-06, 1 school	5 00
Membership dues for 1906-07, 7 schools	35 00
Membership dues for 1907-08, 166 schools	830 00
Membership dues for 1908-09, 2 schools	10 00
Amount of receipts	$1,485 37

DISBURSEMENTS.

For Executive Committee expenses	$101 33	
For reporters, clerks and stenographers	143 00	
For postage and expressage	110 50	
For printing	456 40	
For Board of College Entrance Requirements	28 40	
For salaries	150 00	
For National Conference on Relations of Colleges and Schools	17 20	
For overpaid dues returned	5 00	
Amount of disbursements	$1,011 83	1,011 83
Leaving in my hands a balance of		473 54
The accounts balancing		$1,485 37

Of the Colleges and Schools holding membership in your Association, one has paid no dues for 1905-06, five for 1906-07, and sixteen for 1907-08. Of this amount of $110 possibly the greater part will be paid during the coming year.

Against the balance above stated the Treasurer has in his hands bills which were presented too late to be embodied in this report aggregating $31.35.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN B. KIEFFER, *Treasurer.*

Lancaster, Pa., November 27, 1908.

THE PRESIDENT.—You have heard the Treasurer's report; what is your pleasure?

PROFESOR BRISTOL.—I beg leave to say, as one member of the Committee of Audit, that the report has been examined and found correct, and I would move the acceptance of the Treasurer's report.

The report was accepted.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

The Secretary then presented the report of the Executive Committee, as follows:

The Executive Committee reports that the following schools have been admitted to membership since the last convention:

Stuyvesant High School, New York City; Swarthmore High School, Swarthmore, Pa.; St. Agatha, New York City; Miss Madeira's School for Girls, Washington, D. C.; John F. Maher School, Philadelphia; The Ethical Culture School, New York City.

The following schools have resigned membership:

The Allegheny Preparatory School, Allegheny, Pa.; Miss Ely's School, Greenwich, Conn.; The Cutler School, New York City.

The following committee was appointed to call together the colleges of the Middle States who may wish to join in the organization of a College Entrance Certificate Board:

Prof. Edwin S. Crawley, University of Pennsylvania, chairman; President Rush Rhees, Rochester University; Dr. John D. Van Meter, Woman's College of Baltimore.

The following five representatives of the secondary schools were also appointed on the above board:

Principal W. W. Birdsall, High School for Girls, Philadelphia; Dr. William R. Crabbe, Shady Side Academy, Pittsburg; Director Francis R. Lane, Tome Institute, Port Deposit; Principal J. M. Green, New Jersey State Model School; Principal W. B. Gunnison, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

A committee consisting of six representatives of the secondary schools and six representatives from the colleges was appointed to consider the whole question of entrance requirements.

Those appointed from the colleges were as follows: Prof. George P. Bristol, Cornell University; Prof. Henry D. Thompson, Princeton University; Dr. Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania; President James M. Taylor, Vassar College; President Ira Remsen, Johns Hopkins University; Prof. George R. Carpenter, Columbia University.

Those appointed from the secondary schools were as follows: Headmaster Wilson Farrand, Newark Academy, chairman; Dr. E. J. Goodwin, New York State Education Department; Prof. Julius Sachs, Teachers' College; Principal Walter R. Marsh, St. Paul's School, Garden City, L. I.; Dr. William L. Sayre, Central Manual Training High School, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. D. A. Kennedy, Dearborn-Morgan School.

Prof. Arthur W. Goodspeed, of the University of Pennsylvania, and Principal Frank Rollins, of the Stuyvesant High School, were appointed as representatives of the Association to a Conference Committee on the Physics Requirements for Entrance to College, called by the Entrance Examination Board.

The Executive Committee, in order to prevent the loss of the services of Mr. Croswell to the College Entrance Examination Board, formally requested the president to reappoint Mr. Croswell.

On motion of the Secretary it was decided to print the names of the members of the Association in the Proceedings alphabetically, instead of arranging them by geographical location, as at present.

The report of the Executive Committee was on motion accepted.

REPORT OF THE NOMINATING COMMITTEE.

The Nominating Committee reported as follows:

As officers of the Association for the ensuing year we suggest the following gentlemen:

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION, 1908-1909.

President

President JAMES D. MOFFAT, Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.

Vice-Presidents

President JOHN S. STAHR, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

President JOHN H. FINLEY, College of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.

Dean JOSIAH H. PENNIMAN, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Principal JOHN C. SHARPE, Blair Academy, Blairstown, N. J.

Director THOMAS S. BAKER, Tome Institute, Port Deposit, Md.

Secretary

Prof. ARTHUR H. QUINN, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Treasurer

Prof. JOHN B. KIEFFER, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

Executive Committee

President, Secretary, and Treasurer, ex officio.

Mr. JAMES G. CROSWELL, Master of the Brearley School, New York City.

Principal E. M. HARTMAN, Franklin and Marshall Academy, Lancaster, Pa.

Principal JOHN H. DENBIGH, Morris High School, New York City.

Principal EDWARD RYNEARSON, Central High School, Pittsburg, Pa.

On motion the report was accepted and the secretary was instructed to cast one ballot for the officers as named in the report. They were accordingly elected.*

On motion the President was empowered to appoint six representatives of the preparatory schools on the College Entrance Certificate Board.

He then appointed the following representatives: To serve one year: Principal Stanley Yarnall, Germantown Friends' School, of Philadelphia; Principal W. B. Gunnison, Erasmus Hall High School, of Brooklyn; Principal J. M. Green, New Jersey State Normal School. To serve two years: Principal W. R. Crabbe, Shady Side Academy, of Pittsburg; Principal Virgil Prettyman, Horace Mann High School, of New York; Principal H. W. Dutch, Montclair High School.

---

*Mr. Rynearson resigned from the committee on account of inability to attend the meetings, and Dean Edward H. Griffin, of Johns Hopkins University, was appointed to fill the vacancy.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON UNIFORM REQUIREMENTS IN ENGLISH.

HEADMASTER WILSON FARRAND.—In the absence of Professor Stoddard, I rise to make a report of progress. The three delegates from this Association were Professor Stoddard, Professor Baker, of Columbia, and myself. We met with the delegates from the other associations on February 21 and 22 of last year. The conference found that the work before it was a very large one. It felt that the time had come to take up the whole question of the English requirement from the foundation, and it found that it could not complete its work at that time. It therefore made for the year 1912 very slight changes in the requirement—simply one or two minor substitutions in the books. I will not read the full list, but submit it in printed form. The conference then adjourned for one year, to meet on the 22d of February next, and appointed a sub-committee consisting of Professor Cross, of Yale; Professor Henneman, of the University of the South; Professor Baker, of Columbia; Mr. Giles, of Michigan, and myself, to investigate thoroughly the whole question, to secure information and advice from colleges and schools; and at the meeting on February 22 the conference will take up the question of a complete revision of the requirement.

At this time, therefore, sir, the only thing that we have to report is progress in our work, and that the work will not be completed until February next.

The formal printed report is as follows:

The conference voted that the following requirements for the year 1912 should be recommended to the constituent bodies for adoption:

NOTE.—*No candidate will be accepted in English whose work is notably defective in point of spelling, punctuation, idiom, or division into paragraphs.*

a. READING AND PRACTICE.—A certain number of books will be recommended for reading, nine of which, selected as prescribed below, are to be offered for examination. The form of examination will usually be the writing of a paragraph or two on each of several topics, to be chosen by the candidate from a considerable number—perhaps ten or fifteen—set before him in the examina-

tion paper. The treatment of these topics is designed to test the candidate's power of clear and accurate expression, and will call for only a general knowledge of the substance of the books. In every case knowledge of the book will be regarded as less important than the ability to write good English. In place of a part or the whole of this test, the candidate may present an exercise book, properly certified to by his instructor, containing compositions or other written work done in connection with the reading of the books. In preparation for this part of the requirement, it is important that the candidate shall have been instructed in the fundamental principles of rhetoric.

1912:

Group I (two to be selected).

Shakespeare's *As You Like It, Henry V., Julius Cæsar, Merchant of Venice, Twelfth Night.*

Group II (one to be selected).

Bacon's *Essays;* Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress, Part I; The Sir Roger de Coverley Papers* in the *Spectator;* Franklin's *Autobiography.*

Group III (one to be selected).

Chaucer's *Prologue;* Spenser's *Faerie Queene,* Book I; Pope's *The Rape of the Lock;* Goldsmith's *The Deserted Village;* Palgrave's *Golden Treasury,* First Series, Books II and III, with especial attention to Dryden, Collins, Gray, Cowper, and Burns.

Group IV (two to be selected).

Goldsmith's *The Vicar of Wakefield;* Scott's *Ivanhoe* and *Quentin Durward;* Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables;* Thackeray's *Henry Esmond;* Mrs. Gaskell's *Cranford;* Dickens's *A Tale of Two Cities;* George Eliot's *Silas Marner;* Blackmore's *Lorna Doone.*

Group V (one to be selected).

Irving's *Sketch Book;* Lamb's *Essays of Elia;* De Quincey's *Joan of Arc* and *The English Mail Coach;* Carlyle's *The Hero as Poet, The Hero as Man of Letters,* and *The Hero as King;* Emerson's *Essays,* selected; Ruskin's *Sesame and Lilies.*

Group VI (two to be selected).

Coleridge's *The Ancient Mariner;* Scott's *The Lady of the Lake;* Byron's *Mazeppa* and *The Prisoner of Chillon;* Palgrave's *Golden Treasury,* First Series, Book IV, with especial attention to Wordsworth, Keats, and Shelley; Macaulay's *Lays of Ancient*

Rome; Poe's *Poems;* Lowell's *The Vision of Sir Launfal;* Arnold's *Sohrab* and *Rustum;* Longfellow's *The Courtship of Miles Standish;* Tennyson's *The Princess;* Browning's *Cavalier Tunes, The Lost Leader, How They Brought the Good News from Ghent to Aix, Evelyn Hope, Home Thoughts from Abroad, Home Thoughts from the Sea, Incident of the French Camp, The Boy and the Angel, One Word More, Hervé Riel, Pheidippides.*

b. STUDY AND PRACTICE.—This part of the examination presupposes the thorough study of each of the works named below. The examination will be upon subject-matter, form, and structure. In addition, the candidate may be required to answer questions involving the essentials of English grammar, and questions on the leading facts in those periods of English literary history to which the prescribed works belong.

The books set for this part of the examination will be:

1912:

Shakespeare's *Macbeth;* Milton's *Comus, L'Allegro,* and *Il Penseroso,* or Tennyson's *Gareth and Lynette, Lancelot and Elaine,* and *The Passing of Arthur;* Burke's *Speech on Conciliation with America,* or Washington's *Farewell Address* and Webster's *First Bunker Hill Oration;* Macaulay's *Life of Johnson,* or Carlyle's *Essay on Burns.*

On motion the report was accepted.

REPORT OF THE DELEGATE OF THE ASSOCIATION TO THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE COMMITTEE OF STANDARDS OF COLLEGES AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

THE SECRETARY.—This report has been sent by Prof. Herman V. Ames, the representative of the Association to the Conference Committee on Standards of College and Secondary Schools, who is unable to be present. It is as follows:

To the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland:

As a representative of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland to the recent conference of representatives of various other associations of colleges and preparatory schools, and other similar bodies, held in New York, April 17, at the office of the Carnegie Foundation, I have the honor to make the following report:

Representatives were present from all the associations and boards comprising the membership of the committee, as appears in the accompanying copy of the Constitution, with the exception of that of the College Entrance Certificate Board of the Middle States and Maryland, which has not as yet been organized.

A constitution which had previously been drawn by a committee composed of Mr. George F. MacLean, of Iowa State University; Mr. Wilson Farrand, of the College Entrance Examination Board, and myself, after slight amendments, was adopted, and is herewith submitted. A permanent organization was effected and the following officers chosen: President George F. MacLean, of Iowa State University, as President, and Mr. Wilson Farrand, of the College Entrance Examination Board, as Vice-President, and Dean Fredrick C. Curry, of Williams College, as Secretary and Treasurer, representing the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools.

You will note that the name of the committee was changed to that of The National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The other provisions of the Constitution are, I think, sufficiently clear not to require any explanation. I would, however, call your attention to Article VI of the Constitution, which provides that each organization connected with the committee should contribute $10 annually to meet its incidental expenses. I suppose that this provision of the report would need to be approved by your Executive Committee.

The minutes of the further action of the committee will shortly be printed and, as soon as received, will be forwarded to you. It was the opinion of the various persons present that this committee has a very important mission to perform in connection with the objects stated in Article II of its Constitution.

Respectfully submitted,

HERMAN V. AMES.

The report was on motion accepted. For information of the Association, the Constitution of the conference committee and resolutions passed at the last meeting are printed:

CONSTITUTION.

NAME.

Art. I. The name of this committee shall be The National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

OBJECT.

Art. II. The purpose of the committee shall be to consider standards of admission, matters of common interest to universities, colleges, and secondary schools, and such other questions as may be referred to it.

MEMBERSHIP.

Art. III. The committee shall be composed of delegates from the following organizations:

The New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools, The New England College Entrance Certificate Board, The Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, The College Entrance Examination Board, The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, The Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States, The National Association of State Universities, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and such other organizations as may be elected to membership. The United States Commissioner of Education shall be ex officio a member of the committee.

OFFICERS.

Art. IV. The officers of the committee shall be a President, Vice-President, and Secretary-Treasurer, who shall be elected annually.

MEETINGS.

Art. V. Meetings of the committee shall be held from time to time at the call of the President. There shall be at least one meeting in each year.

FINANCES.

Art. VI. Each organization holding membership in the committee shall be expected to contribute ten dollars annually to meet its incidental expenses.

QUORUM.

Art. VII. Delegates from a majority of the organizations entitled to representation in the committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

AMENDMENT.

Art. VIII. This constitution may be altered or amended at any regularly called meeting of the committee by a vote of two-thirds of the delegates present, each organization represented having one vote.

The following resolutions were passed by the committee:

Resolved, That, in the judgment of this committee, pupils preparing for college should continue work in English and mathematics through the last school year.

Resolved, That the committee respectfully refers to lists of accredited schools prepared by the organizations represented in this committee as lists which it is desirable that colleges should have.

WHEREAS, There is need, in the interest of standardization and of migrating students, of fuller information regarding colleges and universities;

Resolved, That we urge our organizations to collect data concerning, and to study the subject of, the standardization of colleges and universities.

NOTE: The list of approved schools prepared under the auspices of The New England College Entrance Certificate Board may be procured by addressing Professor Nathaniel F. Davis, 159 Brown Street, Providence, R. I. The similar list prepared under the auspices of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools may be obtained by addressing Director George N. Carman, Lewis Institute, Chicago, Ill.

REPORT OF THE DELEGATES OF THE ASSOCIATION TO THE COMMISSION TO REVISE THE DEFINITION OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR ENTRANCE TO COLLEGE IN ELEMENTARY PHYSICS.

To the Association of College and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland:

In my capacity as delegate appointed by the Association on a Commission to Revise the Definition of the Requirements for Entrance to College in Elementary Physics, I beg to make the following informal report pending the complete report of the commission to the College Entrance Examination Board, by which body it was instituted. Copies of the full report, I presume, will be available to any who may desire them.

The commission consisted of the following delegates: Appointed by the College Entrance Examination Board—Prof. Wallace C. Sabine, Dean of the Graduate School of Applied Science of Harvard University; Prof. Henry S. Carhart, University of Michigan; Prof. Alfred D. Cole, Ohio State University; Prof. Arthur W. Goodspeed, University of Pennsylvania; Frank Rollins, Ph.D., Assistant Commissioner of Education for the State of New York. Appointed by the New England Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools—President Flavel S. Luther, Trinity College; John W. Hutchins, A. M., Principal of Malden High School. Appointed by the North Central Association—Prof. C. R. Mann, University of Chicago; Prof. H. L. Terry, Inspector of High Schools, Wisconsin. Appointed by the Southern Association—Prof. C. A. Perkins, University of Tennessee. Appointed by the Middle States and Maryland Association to serve in double capacity, representing this Association as well as the College Entrance Examination Board—Prof. Arthur W. Goodspeed, University of Pennsylvania; Frank Rollins, Ph.D., Assistant Commissioner of Education for the State of New York. Prof. W. C. Sabine was elected chairman, and Mr. John W. Hutchins secretary of the commission.

Preliminary investigations were carried on by several members of the commission endeavoring to learn the wishes of the secondary school teachers of physics. On May 1 and 2 the commission held a session in New York. Resolutions adopted by the

New York Physics Teachers' Association, and also resolutions adopted by the Eastern Association of Physics Teachers were received and considered, as well as certain dissenting minority reports and opinions of members of these associations.

A desire of the secondary schools to secure a clearer outline of topics for study was apparent. The commission also sought to emphasize a general knowledge of the facts and principles of the science. Much time was therefore given to the formation of a "Syllabus of Topics" which should constitute the basis for the individual teacher's selection of the course adapted to his needs. The revised list of experiments excludes the least desirable experiments of the old list.

Freedom in the selection of topics and experiments within certain bounds was acknowledged to be necessary to adapt the course to the needs of the various schools.

The commission therefore recommends the adoption by the College Entrance Examination Board of the following definition of requirements in elementary physics:

PHYSICS.

The course of instruction in physics should include:

(1) The study of one standard text-book for the purpose of obtaining a comprehensive and connected view of the more important *facts* and *laws* of elementary physics.

(2) Instruction by lecture table demonstrations to be used mainly as a basis for questioning upon the general principles and laws of physics and their applications.

(3) Individual laboratory work consisting of experiments requiring approximately the time of thirty double periods. Among the experiments performed by each student there should be thirty not very different from those in the appended list. All divisions of physics should be fairly represented.

The laboratory work forming an essential part of a general elementary course in physics should be conducted with the definite aim of teaching physics as a quantitative science and of training in accurate observation and thought.

Throughout the course special attention should be paid to the common illustrations of physical laws and their industrial applications.

In the solution of the numerical problems, the student should be encouraged to make use of the simple principles of algebra and geometry to reduce the difficulties of solution.

The "Syllabus of Topics" for the classroom and "List of Experiments" for the laboratory are included in the report, and these present in a general way the outline of work that may be covered to advantage in one year. It neither excludes other topics nor requires their complete fulfilment. Since no school would be expected to cover the entire course outlined, twice as many questions will be given on all examinations as any pupil will be required to answer.

Respectfully submitted,

A. W. GOODSPEED.

This report was, on motion, accepted.

THE PRESIDENT.—The Chair has three items of constitutional business to finish. I have now to reappoint Professor Ames as delegate of this Association to the National Conference Committee on Standards of Colleges and Secondary Schools. I reappoint the Committee on Uniform Requirements in English: Prof. Francis H. Stoddard, Prof. Franklin T. Baker, Mr. Wilson Farrand, who are to go on as indicated in the report offered by Mr. Farrand; and, lastly, with many thanks to the Association for the honor conferred upon me by the Executive Committee, I will constitutionally reappoint representatives of the Association on the College Entrance Examination Board: Mr. J. G. Croswell, of New York; Mr. Wilson Farrand, of Newark; Mr. J. H. Denbigh, of New York; Mr. E. J. Goodwin, of Brooklyn, and Mr. J. L. Patterson, of Philadelphia. Is there any other business? If not the meeting is adjourned.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION 1907-1908.

President

Mr. JAMES G. CROSWELL, Master of the Brearley School, New York City.

Vice-Presidents

President JOHN H. HARRIS, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.
Dean THOMAS M. BALLIET, New York University New York City.
Principal WALTER B. GUNNISON, Erasmus Hall High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Principal CHARLES S. CROSSMAN, Haverford School, Haverford, Pa.
Principal EDWARD C. WILSON, Friends' School, Baltimore, Md.

Secretary

Professor ARTHUR H. QUINN, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Treasurer

Professor JOHN B. KIEFFER, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.

Executive Committee

President, Secretary and Treasurer, ex-officio.
President WOODROW WILSON, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
PROF. NELSON G. MCCREA, Columbia University, New York City.
Principal CHARLES D. LARKINS, Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Principal VIRGIL PRETTYMAN, Horace Mann High School, New York City.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1908.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE TWENTY-FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ASSOCIATON OF COLLEGES AND PREPARATORY SCHOOLS OF THE MIDDLE STATES AND MARYLAND.

HELD AT THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 29-30, 1907.

Response to the address of welcome by President WOODROW WILSON, Princeton University.

"The Influence of the Present Methods of Graduate Instruction upon the Teaching in the Secondary School." Dean Thomas M. Balliet, New York University; Principal George E. Myers, McKinley Manual Training High School, Washington, D. C.

Discussion: Professor Ernest G. Sihler, New York University; President John H. Harris, Bucknell University; Prof. Julius Sachs, Columbia University.

"Admission to College by Certificate," by President Rush Rhees, University of Rochester.

Report of the Committee on the Establishment of a College Entrance Certificate Board, by Prof. Edwin S. Crawley, University of Pennsylvania.

General Discussion, by Prof. John K. Lord, Dartmouth College; Prof. Julius Sachs, Columbia University; President Thomas Fell, St. John's College; Prof. John K. Ford, Dartmouth College; Principal Virgil Prettyman, Horace Mann High School, New York City; Principal James M. Green, New Jersey State Normal School, Trenton, N. J.; Dean William H. Crawshaw, Colgate University; Mr. William N. Marcy, Mackenzie School, Dobb's Ferry, N. Y.; Miss Bertha Bass, Wadleigh High School, New York City; Principal William W. Birdsall, High School for Girls, Philadelphia Pa.; Principal Charles D. Larkins, Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Headmaster Wilson Farrand, Newark Academy, Newark, N. J.; Prof. Henry B. Mitchell, Columbia University; Dr. John T. Buchanan, DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City.

President's Address: "School and College," President WOODROW WILSON, Princeton University.

"Preparation for College as a Means of Education," Dr. Thomas S. Baker, Tome Institute, Port Deposit, Md.; Miss Jessie E. Allen, High School for Girls, Philadelphia.

Discussion, by President E. T. Jeffers, York Collegiate Institute, York, Pa.; Prof. William A. Hervey, Columbia University; Mr. James G. Croswell, Master of the Brearley School, New York City.

LIST OF MEMBERS, 1908-9*

INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Adelphi College	Brooklyn, N. Y. (Clifton Pl., St. James Pl. and Lafayette Av.)	Charles H. Levermore, Ph.D.
Agnes Irwin School	Philadelphia (2011 De Lancey Pl.)	Sophy Dallas Irwin.
Albright College	Myerstown, Pa.	James D. Woodring, D.D.
Alfred University	Alfred, N. Y.	Boothe C. Davis, Ph.D.
Allegheny College	Meadville, Pa.	William H. Crawford, D.D.
Arundell School for Girls	Baltimore, Md. (625 St. Paul St.)	Elizabeth Maxwell Carroll.
Asbury Park High School	Asbury Park, N. J.	Frederick S. Shepherd, Ph.D.
Baldwin School	Bryn Mawr, Pa.	Jane C. Brownell.
Balliol School	Utica, N. Y.	Mrs. Louise S. B. Saunders. Edith Rockwell Hall.
Baltimore City College	Baltimore, Md.	Francis A. Soper.
Baltimore Polytechnic Institute	Baltimore, Md. (311 Courtland St.)	William R. King, U.S.N.
Barnard School for Boys	New York City (721 St. Nicholas Av.)	Wm. Livingston Hazen.
Bayonne City High School	Bayonne, N. J.	P. H. Smith.
Beaver College	Beaver, Pa.	Rev. Arthur Staples.
Berkeley Institute	Brooklyn, N. Y. (185 Lincoln Pl.)	Julian W. Abernethy, Ph.D.
Bethlehem Preparatory School	Bethlehem, Pa.	H. A. Foering.
Birmingham School for Girls	Birmingham, Pa.	James G. Miller. Miss N. J. Davis.
Blair Academy	Blairstown, N. J.	John C. Sharpe.
Blairsville College	Blairsville, Pa.	Rev. N. D. Fiscus.
Bordentown Military Inst.	Bordentown, N. J.	Rev. Thompson H. Landon, D.D.
Boys' High School	Brooklyn, N. Y.	James Sullivan, Ph.D.
Boys' High School	Reading, Pa.	Robert S. Birch.
Brearley School	New York City (17 W. 44th St.)	James G. Croswell.
Bryn Mawr College	Bryn Mawr, Pa.	M. Carey Thomas, Ph.D., LL.D.
Bryn Mawr School	Baltimore, Md. (Cathedral and Preston Sts.)	Edith Hamilton.
Bucknell University	Lewisburg, Pa.	John H. Harris, D.D.
Canisius College	Buffalo, N. Y.	Rev. Augustine A. Miller, S.J.
Central High School	Philadelphia (Broad and Green Sts.)	Robert Ellis Thompson, Ph.D., D.D.
Central High School	Pittsburgh, Pa.	Edward Rynearson.
Central Manual Training High School	Philadelphia (17th and Wood Sts.)	William L. Sayre, Sc.D.
Chester High School	Chester, Pa.	Joseph G. Smedley.
Chestnut Hill Academy	Chestnut Hill, Pa.	James L. Patterson.
Colgate Academy	Hamilton, N. Y.	Frank L. Shephardson.
Colgate University	Hamilton, N. Y.	George E. Merrill, D.D., LL.D.
College of the City of New York	New York City	John H. Finley, LL.D.
College of St. Francis Xavier	New York City (30 W. 16th St.)	Rev. D. W. Hearn, S.J.
Collegiate Institute	York, Pa.	Rev. E. T. Jeffers, D.D., LL.D.
Collegiate School	New York City (241 W. 77th St.)	L. C. Mygatt, L.H.D.

*Members are requested to send the Secretary notice of any changes to be made in this list. The only degrees printed are those of the doctorate, in order to ensure correct addressing.

INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Columbia Grammar School	New York City (34 E. 51st St.)	Benajmin Howell Campbell.
Columbia High School	Columbia, Pa.	Mary Y. Welsh.
Columbia University	New York City	Nicholas Murray Butler, LL.D.
Cornell University	Ithaca, N. Y.	J. G. Schurman, LL.D.
Country School	Baltimore, Md.	S. Wardwell Kinney.
Dearborn-Morgan School	Orange, N. J.	David A. Kennedy, Ph.D. Mrs. Abby B. Morgan.
Delaware College	Newark, Del.	George A. Harter, Ph.D.
De Witt Clinton High School	New York City (59th St. and 10th Ave.)	John T. Buchanan.
Dickinson College	Carlisle, Pa.	George Edward Reed, D.D., LL.D.
Eastern District High School	Brooklyn, N. Y. (Drigg's Av. and S. 3d St.)	William T. Vlymen, Ph.D.
Eastern High School	Baltimore, Md.	Robert R. Wright.
Easton High School	Easton, Pa.	William A. Jones.
East Orange High School	East Orange, N. J.	Charles W. Evans.
Emma Willard School	Troy, N. Y.	Anna Leach.
Episcopal Academy	Philadelphia, Pa.	William H. Klapp, M.D.
Erasmus Hall High School	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Walter B. Gunnison.
Ethical Culture School	New York City (Central Park W. and 63d St.)	William E. Stark.
Franklin and Marshall Acad.	Lancaster, Pa.	E. M. Hartman.
Franklin and Marshall College	Lancaster, Pa.	John S. Stahr, Ph.D., D.D
Friends' Central High School	Philadelphia (15th and Race Sts.)	J. Eugene Baker. Anna W. Speakman.
Friends' School	Baltimore, Md.	E. C. Wilson.
Friends' School	Germantown, Phila. (Coulter St.)	Stanley R. Yarnall.
Friends' School	Washington, D. C. (1809 I St.)	Thomas W. Sidwell.
Friends' School	Wilmington, Del.	Herschel A. Norris.
Friends' Select School	Philadelphia (140 N. 16th St.)	J. Henry Bartlett.
Friends' Seminary	New York City (226 E. 16th St.)	Edward B. Rawson.
Gallaudet College	Washington, D. C.	Edw. Minor Gallaudet, LL.D.
George School	George School, Pa.	J. S. Walton, Ph.D.
Georgetown College	Georgetown, D. C.	Rev. David H. Buell, S.J.
George Washington University	Washington, D. C.	Charles W. Needham, D.D., LL.D.
Germantown Academy	Philadelphia (Gtn.)	William Kershaw, Ph.D.
Girls' Commercial High School	Philadelphia (Broad and Green Sts.)	Emily L. Graham.
Girls' High School	Brooklyn, N. Y.	W. L. Felter, Ph.D.
Girls' High School	Philadelphia (17th and Spring Garden Sts.)	W. W. Birdsall.
Girls' Latin School	Baltimore, Md. (24th and St. Paul's Sts.)	Leonard A. Blue.
Girls' Normal School	Philadelphia (1301 Spring Garden St.)	J. Monroe Willard.
Halsted School	Yonkers, N. Y.	Mary S. Jenkins.
Hamilton College	Clinton, N. Y.	M. Woolsey Stryker, D.D., LL.D.
Haverford College	Haverford, Pa.	Isaac Sharpless, LL.D.
Haverford School	Haverford, Pa.	Charles S. Crossman.
Hill School	Pottstown, Pa.	John Meigs, Ph.D.
Hobart College	Geneva, N. Y.	Rev. Langdon C. Stewardson, LL.D.
Dr. Holbrook's School	Ossining, N. Y.	Dwight Holbrook, Ph.D.
Holman School for Girls	Philadelphia (2209 Walnut St.)	Adèle B. Ebbinghausen
Horace Mann School	New York City	Virgil Prettyman, Ph.D.

INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Howard University	Washington, D. C.	Rev. Wilbur P. Thirkield, D.D., LL.D.
Irving School	New York City (35 W. 84th St.)	Louis Dwight Ray, Ph.D.
Johns Hopkins University	Baltimore, Md.	Ira Remsen, LL.D.
Kee Mar College	Hagerstown, Md.	J. Emory Shaw.
Kent Place School	Summit, N. J.	Mrs. Sarah Woodman Paul.
Lafayette College	Easton, Pa.	Ethelbert D. Warfield, LL.D.
Lansdowne High School	Lansdowne, Pa.	Walter L. Philips.
Lawrenceville School	Lawrenceville, N. J.	S. J. McPherson, Ph.D.
Lebanon Valley College	Annville, Pa.	Rev. A. P. Funkhouser.
Lehigh University	S. Bethlehem, Pa.	Henry S. Drinker, LL.D.
Linden Hall Seminary	Lititz, Pa.	Rev. Charles D. Kreider.
Loyola School	New York City (65 E. 83d St.)	Rev. N. N. McKinnon, S.J.
McDonogh School	McDonogh, Md.	Sidney T. Moreland.
Mackenzie School	Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.	Rev. James C. Mackenzie, Ph.D.
Miss Madeira School	Washington, D. C. (1326 19th St.)	Lucy Madeira.
Maher Preparatory School	Philadelphia (605 Hale Bldg.)	John F. Maher.
Manhattan College	New York City (Grand Boulevard and 131st St.)	Brother Jerome.
Manual Training High School	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Charles D. Larkins.
Maryland State Normal School	Baltimore, Md.	George Washington Ward, Ph.D.
Mercersburg Academy	Mercersburg, Pa.	William Mann Irvine, Ph.D.
Mohegan Lake School	Mohegan, N. Y.	Henry Waters. Albert E. Linder.
Montclair Military Academy	Montclair, N. J.	John G. Mac Vicar.
Montclair High School	Montclair, N. J.	H. W. Dutch.
Moravian Parochial School	Bethlehem, Pa.	Albert G. Rau.
Moravian Seminary	Bethlehem, Pa.	J. Max Hark, D.D.
Morris High School	New York City (Boston Road and 166th St.)	John H. Denbigh.
Morristown School	Morristown, N. J.	Francis C. Woodman.
Mt. Pleasant Academy	Ossining, N. Y.	C. F. Brusie.
Muhlenberg College	Allentown, Pa.	Rev. John A. W. Haas, D.D.
Neptune Township High School	Ocean Grove, N. J.	L. A. Doren.
Newark Academy	Newark, N. J.	Wilson Farrand.
Newark High School	Newark, N. J.	W. E. Stearns.
New York University	New York City	Henry M. MacCracken, D.D., LL.D.
Normal College	New York City (Park Av. and 68th St.)	George S. Davis, Ph.D.
Northeast Manual Training High School	Philadelphia, Pa.	Andrew J. Morrison, Ph.D.
Packer Institute	Brooklyn, N. Y.	Edwin J. Goodwin, Ph.D.
Paterson High School	Paterson, N. J. (160 Market St.)	J. A. Reinhart.
Peddie Institute	Hightstown, N. J.	Roger W. Swetland.
Penn Hall	Chambersburg, Pa.	Magnus C. Ihlseng, Ph.D.
Pennsylvania State College	State College, Pa.	E. E. Sparks, Ph.D.
Perkiomen Seminary	Pennsburg, Pa.	Rev. O. S. Kriebel.
Philadelphia Collegiate Institute	Philadelphia (1720 Arch St.)	Susan C. Lodge.
Pingry School	Elizabeth, N. J.	S. Archibald Smith.
Plainfield High School	Plainfield, N. J.	I. W. Travell.
Polytechnic Prep. School	Brooklyn, N. Y. (99 Livingston St.)	Alvan E. Duerr.
Princeton University	Princeton, N. J.	Woodrow Wilson, LL.D.
Rand Collegiate School	Trenton, N. J.	Edwin W. Rand.
(Misses) Rayson's School	New York City (164 W. 75th St.)	Amy Rayson.
Red Bank High School	Redbank, N. J.	S. V. Arrowsmith.

INSTITUTION.	LOCATION.	HEAD OF INSTITUTION.
Riverview Academy	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	J. B. Bisbee.
Rutgers College	New Brunswick, N. J.	W. H. S. Demarest, D.D.
Rutgers Preparatory Academy	New Brunswick, N. J.	Eliot R. Payson, Ph.D.
Rye Seminary	Rye, N. Y.	Mrs. Life and the Misses Stowe.
Sachs' Collegiate Institute	New York City (38 W. 59th St.)	Otto Koenig, J.U.D.
Sach's School for Girls	New York City (116 W. 59th St.)	C. H. Liete.
St. Agatha	New York City (257 W. 86th St.)	Emma G. Sebring.
St. Agnes School	Albany, N. Y.	Catharine Regina Seabury.
St. John's College	Annapolis, Md.	Thomas Fell, LL.D.
St. Lawrence University	Canton, N. Y.	Rev. Almon Gunnison, D.D., LL.D.
St. Luke's School	Wayne, Pa.	Charles Henry Strout.
St. Mary's Hall	Burlington, N. J.	John Fearnley.
St. Paul's School	Garden City, L. I.	Walter R. Marsh.
St. Stephen's College	Annandale, N. Y.	Rev. Thomas R. Harris, D.D.
Shady Side Academy	Pittsburg, Pa. (5035 Castleman St.)	W. R. Crabbe, Ph.D.
(Miss) Stahr's School	Lancaster, Pa.	Alice H. Byrne.
State Model School	Trenton, N. J.	James M. Green, Ph.D.
Staten Island Academy	New Brighton, N. Y.	Frederick E. Partington.
State Normal School	West Chester, Pa.	G. M. Phillips, Ph.D.
(Miss) Stuart's School	Pittsburgh, Pa. (4721 Fifth Ave.)	Ella Gordon Stuart.
Stuyvesant High School	New York City (345 E. 15th St.)	Ernest R. Von Nardroff, Ph.D.
Swarthmore College	Swarthmore, Pa.	Joseph Swain, LL.D.
Swarthmore High School	Swarthmore, Pa.	B. Holmes Wallace.
Swarthmore Prep. School	Swarthmore, Pa.	Arthur H. Tomlinson.
Syracuse University	Syracuse, N. Y.	Rev. Jas. Roscoe Day, S.T.D., LL.D.
Temple College	Philadelphia, Pa.	Rev. R. H. Conwell.
Thurston Preparatory School	Pittsburgh, Pa. (Shady Av.)	Alice M. Thurston.
Tome School for Boys	Port Deposit, Md.	Thomas S. Baker, Ph.D.
Union College	Schenectady, N. Y.	B. H. Ripton, Dean.
University of Pennsylvania	Philadelphia, Pa.	Charles C. Harrison, LL.D.
University of Rochester	Rochester, N. Y.	Rush Rhees, LL.D.
Univ. of the State of N. Y.	Albany, N. Y.	Andrew S. Draper, LL.D.
Ursinus College	Collegeville, Pa.	George L. Omwake, Dean.
Vassar College	Poughkeepsie, N. Y.	James M. Taylor, D.D., LL.D.
Wadleigh High School	New York City (114th St. and 7th Av.)	John G. Wight, Ph.D.
Warren High School	Warren, Pa.	W. L. MacGowan.
Washington and Jefferson Academy	Washington, Pa.	James N. Rule.
Washington and Jefferson College	Washington, Pa.	James D. Moffatt, D.D.
Washington College	Chestertown, Md.	James W. Cain, LL.D.
Washington School for Boys	Washington, D. C. (Wisconsin Av.)	Louis L. Hooper.
Waynesburg College	Waynesburg, Pa.	A. F. Lewis.
Wells College	Aurora, N. Y.	Rev. Geo. Morgan Ward, D.D.
West Chester High School	West Chester, Pa.	Addison L. Jones.
Western High School	Baltimore, Md.	David E. Weglein.
Western Maryland College	Westminster, Md.	Rev. Thomas Hamilton Lewis, D.D.
Western University of Pa.	Allegheny, Pa.	Samuel Black McCormick, D.D., LL.D.
Westtown Boarding School	Westtown, Pa.	William F. Wickersham.
Wilmington High School	Wilmington, Del.	A. H. Berlin.
Wilson College	Chambersburg, Pa.	M. H. Reaser, Ph.D.
Woman's College	Baltimore, Md.	John Franklin Goucher, LL.D.
Woman's College	Frederick, Md.	Joseph H. Apple.
Wyoming Seminary	Kingston, Pa.	Rev. L. L. Sprague, D.D.
Yeates School	Lancaster, Pa.	Rev. Frederick Gardiner.
Yonkers High School	Yonkers, N. Y.	William A. Edwards.

DELEGATES REGISTERED, 1908.

ALBRIGHT COLLEGE, *Myerstown, Pa.* Clellan A. Bowman, President; A. E. Gobble, W. S. Keiter, H. Franklin Schlegel, William P. Winter.

BALDWIN SCHOOL, *Bryn Mawr, Pa.* Jane L. Brownell, Principal.

BETHLEHEM PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *Bethlehem, Pa.* Thomas K. Smith.

BIRMINGHAM SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, *Birmingham, Pa.* Miss N. J. Davis, Co-Principal; A. R. Grier, President.

BORDENTOWN MILITARY INSTITUTE, *Bordentown, N. J.* Rev. T. H. Landon, Headmaster.

BREARLEY SCHOOL, *17 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City.* James G. Croswell, Master.

BRYN MAWR SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* Mary Sherwood.

BUCKNELL UNIVERSITY, *Lewisburg, Pa.* John H. Harris, President.

CARNEGIE FOUNDATION, *576 Fifth Avenue, New York City.* John G. Bowman, Secretary.

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Walter Roberts, J. T. Rorer, G. A. Snook.

COLUMBIA HIGH SCHOOL, *Lancaster, Pa.* Rebecca J. Sauber.

COLUMBIA HIGH SCHOOL, *Columbia, Pa.* Mary Y. Welsh, Principal.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, *New York City.* James H. Canfield, Thomas S. Fiske, Gonzalez Lodge, Julius Sachs.

COMMERCIAL HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Carolyn W. Stretch.

CONWAY HALL, *Carlisle, Pa.* W. A. Hutchinson.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY, *Ithaca, N. Y.* George P. Bristol.

DELAWARE COLLEGE, *Newark, Del.* George A. Harter, President; W. Owen Sypherd.

DICKINSON COLLEGE, *Carlisle, Pa.* W. L. Gooding, G. W. Moore, J. H. Morgan, Dean; C. W. Prettyman, M. W. Prince.

DOWNINGTOWN HIGH SCHOOL, *Dowingtown, Pa.* John R. Hunsieker, Principal.

DREXEL INSTITUTE, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Henry V. Gummere.

EASTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, *Lancaster, Pa.* Erwin H. DeLong.

EASTON HIGH SCHOOL, *Easton, Pa.* Susan R. Miller.

EPISCOPAL ACADEMY, *Philadelphia, Pa.* William H. Klapp, Headmaster; Jefferson Shiel.

ETHICAL CULTURE SCHOOL, *New York City.* William E. Stark, Principal.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL ACADEMY, *Lancaster, Pa.* R. G. Appel, Edwin M. Hartman, Principal; J. G. Helin, Edwin A. Nace, J. N. Schaeffer, F. Lyman Windolph, M. W. Witmer.

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE, *Lancaster, Pa.* A. T. G. Apple, John M. Chambers, Joseph H. Dubbs, C. N. Heller, A. V. Hiester, John B. Kieffer, George F. Mull, R. C. Schiedt, John S. Stahr, President; Garrett W. Thompson.

FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.* Francis N. Maxfield, E. W. Wistar, Stanley R. Yarnall, Principal.

FRIENDS' SCHOOL, *Washington, D. C.* Mrs. Thomas W. Sidwell.

FRIENDS' CENTRAL SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* J. Eugene Baker, W. E. Barrett, Abigail Jackson.

FRIENDS' GRADED SCHOOL, *West Chester, Pa.* Anna B. Smedley, Principal.

FRIENDS' SELECT SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Walter W. Haviland, Master; Samuel C. Wutins.

FRIENDS' SEMINARY, *New York City.* Alice S. Palmer, Principal.

GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, *Washington, D. C.* William A. Wilbur, Dean.

GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY, *Washington, D. C.* Rev. Charles Macksey, S. J.

GIRLS' HIGH SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Elizabeth B. Albrecht, Amy Bowman, Ira Bowman, Emma H. Carroll, Louise Haeseler, Sarah P. Miller, Katharine C. Puncheon, Margaret Sproul, A. C. Wight, Evaline Young.

GIRLS' LATIN SCHOOL, *Baltimore, Md.* Leonard A. Blue, N. M. Wilmot, Jeannette L. Wilmot.

GUNSTON HALL, *Washington, D. C.* Edith M. Clark.

Harrisburg, Pa. Nathan C. Schaeffer, Superintendent of Public Instruction.

HAVERFORD COLLEGE, *Haverford, Pa.* W. H. Jackson.

HIGH SCHOOL, *Easton, Pa.* E. C. Lavers.

HIGH SCHOOL FOR BOYS, *Reading, Pa.* Robert S. Birch, Principal.

MISS HILL'S SCHOOL, *Philadelphia. Pa.* Miss Florence Jackson, Associate Principal; Caroline L. Steele.

HOLMAN SCHOOL, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Harriet M. Brownell, Adele D. Ebbinghausen, Principal; Genevieve A. Shryock.

HORACE MANN SCHOOL, *New York City.* Virgil Prettyman, Principal.

IRVING SCHOOL, *New York City.* L. D. Ray, Mrs. L. D. Ray.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, *Baltimore, Md.* Murray Peabody Brush, John C. French.

KENT PLACE SCHOOL, *Summit, N. J.* Mrs. S. W. Paul, Principal; A. S. Woodman.

LANSDOWNE HIGH SCHOOL, *Lansdowne, Pa.* Walter L. Philips.

LAWRENCEVILLE SCHOOL, *Lawrenceville, N. J.* Fletcher Durell.

LAFAYETTE COLLEGE, *Easton, Pa.* E. D. Warfield, President.

LEBANON VALLEY COLLEGE, *Annville, Pa.* Andrew Bender, E. Benjamin Bierman, J. E. Lehman, S. Edwin Rupp, H. H. Shenk, Dean; John S. Shippee.

LEHIGH UNIVERSITY, *South Bethlehem, Pa.* John L. Stewart, C. L. Thornburg.

LINDEN HALL, *Lititz, Pa.* [Miss] V. Gerhart, Mrs. Charles D. Kreider, Helen E. Shields, Lucy A. Tietze.

McDONOGH SCHOOL, *McDonogh, Md.* S. T. Moreland.

MACKENZIE SCHOOL, *Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.* Alexander Mackenzie, James C. Mackenzie, Director; William N. Marcy, H. A. Prichard.

MERCERSBURG ACADEMY, *Mercersburg, Pa.* G. L. Shelley.

Montclair, N. J. Randall Spaulding, Superintendent of Schools.

MONTCLAIR HIGH SCHOOL, *Montclair, N. J.* Herbert W. Dutch, Principal.

MORAVIAN SEMINARY, *Bethlehem, Pa.* Helena M. Hoch.

NEWARK ACADEMY, *Newark, N. J.* Wilson Farrand, Headmaster.

NORMAL COLLEGE, *New York City*. Lao G. Simons.
OLEY ACADEMY, *Oley, Pa.* Carl G. Leech.
PATERSON HIGH SCHOOL, *Paterson, N. J.* Edward M. Roeder.
PEDDIE INSTITUTE, *Hightstown, N. J.* Sherman A. Allen, Nelson L. Green, R. E. Harmon, R. W. Swetland, Principal.
PENNSYLVANIA COLLEGE, *Gettysburg, Pa.* S. G. Hefelbower, President.
PENN HALL, *Chambersburg, Pa.* M. C. Ihlseng.
PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE, *State College, Pa.* Edwin Erle Sparks, President.
PERKIOMEN SEMINARY, *Pennsburg, Pa.* Rev. O. S. Kriebel.
PHILADELPHIA COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Miss Susan C. Lodge, Principal.
POLYTECHNIC PREPARATORY SCHOOL, *Brooklyn, N. Y.* G. W. M. Maier, Eugene R. Smith.
MISSES RAYSON'S SCHOOL, *New York City*. Amy Rayson, M. E. Rayson.
RIVERVIEW ACADEMY, *Poughkeepsie, N. Y.* Josiah Bartlett.
RUTGERS COLLEGE, *New Brunswick, N. J.* Louis Bevier, Jr.
RIEGELSVILLE ACADEMY, *Riegelsville, Pa.* Glenn C. Heller, Principal.
ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, *Annapolis, Md.* Thomas Fell, President.
ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Rev. W. S. Singleton, S. J.
SHADY SIDE ACADEMY, *Pittsburg, Pa.* W. R. Crabbe, J. B. Hench.
SHIPPEN SCHOOL, *Lancaster, Pa.* Inez H. Barclay, A. S. Johns, Kirk Johnson, Alice Webb Stockwell.
STUYVESANT HIGH SCHOOL, *New York City*. William E. Breckenridge.
SWARTHMORE HIGH SCHOOL, *Swarthmore, Pa.* B. Holmes Wallace, Principal.
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY, *Syracuse, N. Y.* W. H. Metsler.
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH, *Lancaster, Pa.* George W. Richards.
TOME SCHOOL FOR BOYS, *Port Deposit, Md.* Thomas S. Baker, Headmaster.
UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, *Albany, N. Y.* Frank Rollins.
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA, *Philadelphia, Pa.* Edwin S. Crawley, Arthur H. Quinn, Lightner Witmer.
URSINUS COLLEGE, *Collegeville, Pa.* W. A. Kline, George Leslie Omwake, Dean.
WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON COLLEGE, Washington, Pa. Robert B. English, James D. Moffat, President.
WASHINGTON AND JEFFERSON ACADEMY, *Washington, Pa.* James N. Rule.
WEST CHESTER HIGH SCHOOL, *West Chester, Pa.* Oren J. Barnes, Principal.
WESTTOWN BOARDING SCHOOL, *Westtown, Pa.* William F. Wickersham, Principal.
WILSON COLLEGE, *Chambersburg, Pa.* Adelaide Bird, Mabel I. Hart.
WOMAN'S COLLEGE, *Frederick, Md.* J. H. Apple, President, Nellie P. Blanchard, [Miss] W. A. Lantz, Lilian Welsh.
YEATES SCHOOL, *Lancaster, Pa.* Rev. F. Gardiner, Principal, Mrs. Frederic Gardiner, Willard H. Stansfield.
YORK COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE, *York, Pa.* Margaret S. Bixby, Albert B. Carner, Edith H. Chapman, E. T. Jeffers, President.

To avoid fine, this book should be returned on
or before the date last stamped below

25M—7-42

BASEMENT

Stanford University Libraries
3 6105 007 924 561

370.6
M627
v.21-22
1909-10

121960

LIBRARY, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION